THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Saturday, the 31st October 1931.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

Usman Sahib Bahadur, *Kt.*, The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Campbell, C.S.I., C.I.E., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. A. Y. G.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Muniswami Nayudu, The hon. Diwan Bahadur B.
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur, S.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
Alamelumanga Thayaramma, Mrs. K.
Annamalai Chettiyar, Mr. S. A. A.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Birley, Mr. F.
Browning, Mr. W. M.
Conran Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E.
Devadasan, Mr. M.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Duraiswami Reddiyar, Mr. K. M.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Foulkes, Mr. R.
Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.
Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Indrayya, Mr. C.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Kondappa, Mr. A.
Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Krishnaswami Ayyar, Diwan Bahadur Alladi.
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Luker, Mr. F. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moses, Mr. P. C.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Mr. P. C.
Nachiyappa Goundar, Mr. K. A.
Nadimuthu Pillai, Mr. A. Pl. N. V.
Nanjappah Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasa Reddi, Mr. T.
Narasimhaswami, Mr. D. V.
Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P.
Narayanaswami Pillai, Rao Bahadur T. M.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Pattagar of Palayakottai, The
Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Raja of Kallikote, The
Ramakrishna Reddi, Mr. A.
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Ramamurti, I.C.S., Mr. S. V.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur, C. S.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Satyanarayana Choudari, Mr. C.

PRESENT—*cont.*

Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.
Siva Raj, Mr. N.
Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
Soundara Pandian, Mr. W. P. A.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.
Sriramulu, Mr. G.
Subrahmanyam Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Tottenham, I.C.S., Mr. G. R. F.
Vasudeva Pillai, Mr. V. G.
Vedachala Mudaliyar, Mr. M.
Venkatarama Ayyar, Mr. K. R.
Venkataramayya, Rao Sahib Badeti.
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Winter, Mr. W. E.
Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.
Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The
Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The

I.—SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. J. A. THORNE made the prescribed oath or affirmation of allegiance to the Crown and took his seat.

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Education

Non-observance of the three years' rule in the case of the Personal Assistant to the Director of Public Instruction and the Deputy Director of Public Instruction.

*346 *Q.*—Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state what special reasons have constrained the Government to continue the present Personal Assistant to the Director of Public Instruction and the present Deputy Director of Public Instruction (personnel) in their posts for a period longer than the usual three years' period?

A.—No rule has been laid down fixing a definite period for the tenure of the offices of Deputy Directors and Personal Assistant.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I know whether Government will consider the desirability of making transfers of these officers in view of the fact that they have remained in these posts too long, where naturally they may have their own likes and dislikes so far as the establishment is concerned ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" Yes, Sir, I shall consider that. "

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether it is not a fact that such a policy is being followed in other departments of Government in the City of Madras ? "

31st October 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Certain posts have been classified as tenure posts, the incumbents of which ought not to remain in those posts for more than three years. These posts have not been classified as such."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether these officers will be classified as such?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"That question was once considered by the Government and dropped."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the answer that has just been given, may I know if the hon. the Minister will consider again the desirability of bringing these posts also under tenure posts?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"I have already said that I would consider the desirability of transferring these officers. This is a new question; and I shall consider this also."

Need for the abolition of the post of the Deputy Directress.

* 347 Q.—Mr. M. B. RANGASWAMI REDDI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is a post of Deputy Directress in the office of the Director of Public Instruction, Madras;

(*b*) what is the approximate annual expenditure incurred by retaining this post by way of—(1) pay, (2) special pay, (3) overseas pay, (4) local allowance, (5) travelling allowance and (6) other allowances, if any;

(*c*) whether a similar post exists in any of the other major provinces of India;

(*d*) what will be the annual saving that will be effected by abolishing this post; and

(*e*) whether there is any proposal to abolish this post in connexion with the proposals for the retrenchment of public expenditure?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The post is held by an officer of the I.E.S. Women's branch. The present incumbent draws Rs. 625 a month in the scale of pay of the ordinary grade of the service, Rs. 400—25—850 with an overseas pay of Rs. 100 a month. She is also granted a special pay of Rs. 100 and house-rent allowance of Rs. 100 a month.

The amount spent on the travelling allowance of the Deputy Directress from July 1930 to June 1931 was Rs. 847.

(*c*) Similar posts exist in Bihar and Orissa and in the Punjab.

(*d*) The eventual saving will be the expenditure referred to in the answer to clause (*b*).

(*e*) The retrenchment proposals in the Education Department are still under the consideration of the Retrenchment Committee and the recommendations of the Committee have not been received by the Government yet.

[31st October 1931

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know the special reason for retaining the Deputy Directress in her office for such a long time ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" There was no special reason to remove her; that is all I can say. "

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—" May I know if the hon. the Minister is not aware that there is a reason for removing her ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—" I am not at present in a position to say anything about that, without a longer notice than this. "

Deputy Directress of Public Instruction.

* 348 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) who is the Deputy Directress of Public Instruction;

(*b*) how long she has been holding that appointment;

(*c*) whether there are any Indian women officers of the Indian Educational Service who are seniors to her; and

(*d*) whether there is any proposal to appoint an Indian woman officer to the post of Deputy Directress of Public Instruction?

A.—(*a*) Miss Irene H. Lowe.

(*b*) She has been holding the post since the 17th August 1926. During this period she has been on leave for about eleven months.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No.

Tours made by the Deputy Directress of Public Instruction.

* 349 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi:— Will the hon the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) what tours were made by the Deputy Directress of Public Instruction during each of the months from July 1930 to June 1931;

(*b*) what expenditure was incurred on travelling allowance in respect of these tours during each of these months; and

(*c*) what specific work was done by the Deputy Directress in each of these tours?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The following statement gives the information:—

Month.	Districts visited.	Expenditure on travelling allowance.
July 1930	Vizagapatam and East Godavari.	About Rs. 107
January 1931 ..	North Arcot	61
March 1931 ..	Guntur	105
	South Arcot and Tanjore ..	91
	Chingleput	32
June 1931	Coimbatore	451
	Malabar	
	Anantapur	
	Bellary	
	Kurnool	
	Cuddapah	

31st October 1931]

(c) In each of the tours useful information was collected in regard to questions affecting individual schools which required local investigation and also in respect of the general question of the development of female education in the locality.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I know, with reference to the answer to clause (c) of the question, what information has been obtained ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" I cannot say without notice. Abundant information has been received which the Government consider useful."

Alleged petition for the removal of Miss B. Amirthammal from Government service.

*350 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether Miss B. Amirthammal, Lecturer in the Lady Willingdon Training College, was on leave from 23rd January to 23rd February 1931 and, if so, for what reason;

(b) whether on the expiry of her leave she took her residence in the Widows' Home attached to the College, and, if so, on what terms, and on whose permission; and

(c) whether any petitions were received by the Superintendent of the Home and by the Government for her removal from the Home and from Government service and how they have been disposed of and why?

A.—(a) Miss B. Amirthammal was granted leave for 25 days from the 26th January 1931 for reasons of health.

(b) The Principal has reported that Miss Amirthammal stayed in the Ice House Hostel for the last five days of February, the whole of March and the first five days of April 1931 and that she paid the hostel at the rate of 12 annas a day in February and April and Rs. 15 for the month of March. The Principal accorded permission to the lecturer to stay in the hostel.

(c) It is stated that two petitions were received by the Superintendent of the hostel who showed them to the Principal, but took no further action on them as they were anonymous. Petitions were also received by Government who examined the allegations made and came to the conclusion that no enquiry was called for.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know whether Miss B. Amirthammal was granted leave for real ill-health or for any other reason ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" It was for ill-health, Sir. "

[31st October 1931

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" Was there any certificate produced, Sir ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I think so. "

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know, Sir, why she was allowed to stay in the Ice House Home? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" She stayed there with the permission of the Principal and as a guest of one of the residents of the Home. "

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" Has there been any other such woman who was allowed to reside in the Ice House Home ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Notice, Sir. "

Appointment of Mr. N. Sivaraj as an Assistant Professor in the Law College.

* 351 *Q.*—Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Law College Council did not originally send up the name of Mr. N. Sivaraj for appointment as a Lecturer in the Law College;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the Government addressed the President of the Law College Council with a view to obtain his consent to the appointment of Mr. N. Sivaraj on the ground of his being a member of the depressed classes and his previous experience for six years as a Lecturer in the College;

(*c*) whether the President in reply informed the Government that the desirability of appointing a member of the depressed classes as Assistant Professor had been considered by the College Council and that nevertheless the Council was unanimously of opinion that Mr. Sivaraj was incompetent for the post; and

(*d*) if so, what reasons compelled the Government to appoint Mr. Sivaraj as an Assistant Professor?

A.—The Government are not prepared to publish correspondence relating to appointments, which is treated as confidential.

Personnel of the Selection Committees of the Teachers' College, Saidapet, and the Engineering College, Guindy.

* 352 *Q.*—Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state the number and names of gentlemen serving on the students' selection committees in the Teachers' College, Saidapet, and the Engineering College, Guindy?

31st October 1931]

Teachers' College, Saidapet (5).

A.—1. The Principal of the College.
2. M.R.Ry. S. Balakrishna Ayyar Avargal, Lecturer, Teachers' College, Saidapet.
3. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar Avargal, M.L.A.
4. M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib N. Chengal Rao Avargal, Retired Registrar, Madras Secretariat.
5. Khan Bahadur Abdul Razak Sahib Bahadur, Chairman, Municipal Council, Saidapet.

College of Engineering, Guindy (6).

1. The Principal of the College.
2. Mr. M. Lingard, Chief Engineer, Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.
3. Khan Bahadur Abdul Razak Sahib Bahadur, Chairman, Municipal Council, Saidapet.
4. M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar Avargal, Zamindar of Chunampet.
5. M.R.Ry. P. Ramanathan Avargal, Solicitor, Madras.
6. M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja Avargal, M.L.A.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I ask if these Committees are appointed from time to time or, when once they are appointed, they go on for ever ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" They are appointed from time to time; the period is three years, if I am not mistaken. "

Admission of Andhra students in the Presidency College, Madras.

* 353 *Q.*—Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) what is the total number of applicants and total number of admissions into the Intermediate classes (Arts course) of the Presidency College, Madras;

(*b*) of these, how many applications were received from the students of 'Andhra Desa', and how many of them were actually admitted;

(*c*) what is the personnel of the Committee of selection of students for admission into the College, and how many persons from 'Andhra Desa' were included in the Committee; and

(*d*) what are the functions of the Committee?

A.—(*a*) 457 and 175 respectively.

(*b*) Number of applications received 35
Number of candidates who were offered admission and to whom admission cards were sent 21
Number that actually joined 14

[31st October 1931

(c) (1) The Principal of the College.
(2) M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar Avargal, M.L.C.
(3) The hon. Diwan Bahadur G. Narayanaswami Chetti Garu, C.I.E.
(4) M.R.Ry. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar Avargal, M.L.C.
(5) Khan Bahadur Haji Muhammad Abdul Aziz Badsha Sahib Bahadur.
(6) M.R.Ry. C. K. Krishnaswami Pillai Avargal, Professor of Geology in the College.
(7) M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur T. Varadarajalu Nayudu Garu, Retired District Judge.

The Committee is not constituted on a linguistic or territorial basis.

(d) The Committee is to assist the Principal of the College in the selection and admission of students into the College.

Advisability of holding parallel examinations under the old and new S.S.L.C. schemes.

*354 *Q.*—Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that there is a great difference in the curricula of the old S.S.L.C. scheme and the new S.S.L.C. scheme; and

(b) whether the Government will be pleased to consider the advisability of making arrangements for the holding of parallel examinations under both the schemes for a period of another two years at least to relieve the hardship of students reading in the V and VI forms at present and the failed S.S.L.C. students of previous years?

A.—(a) There is a difference between the old and the new S.S.L.C. scheme.

(b) Orders have already been issued directing that the public examination in accordance with the old scheme should be held in the years 1932 and 1933 for the benefit of pupils who studied in form VI in 1930-31, but did not appear for the public examination in March 1931 and of those who appeared for the examination in 1931 or in previous years, but were not declared eligible for admission to the University courses of study.

Death of the boarders of the Mission Hostel, Erode.

*355 *Q.*—Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government know that there were several deaths of the boarders in the Mission Hostel at Erode a few months back;

(b) whether it is a fact that this sudden death was due to a poison caused by a reptile being boiled with the rice;

(c) if the answer to (b) be in the negative, the real cause for such sudden deaths;

31st October 1931]

(*d*) who is in charge of the hostel and what is his explanation to the authorities concerned; and

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the head of the hostel would not permit the parents to remove their suffering children when they were in an unconscious state for medical aid?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) Cholera.

(*d*) The Reverend W. Clewes was the manager and Mr. J. T. Rajanayagam the headmaster of the institution. There were also resident masters in charge of the different units of the hostel.

The headmaster's explanation was that the outbreak was due to a very virulent type of cholera infection in the food eaten by the boarders at night.

(*e*) It is not a fact that any student was denied medical aid. All patients were admitted into hospital and received immediate medical attention.

Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai:—"With reference to answer to clause (*d*) of the question where it is stated 'the outbreak was due to a very virulent type of cholera infection in the food eaten by the boarders at night,' may I know what action has been taken against those who were responsible for the death of some of the boarders?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"As far as I am aware, nobody was particularly responsible for that, and an investigation was made and the necessary sanitary improvements have been effected. Beyond that, no notice seemed called for in the matter."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether cholera was prevalent in Erode prior to its outbreak in the boarding house?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"Notice, Sir."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know what the Government mean by saying in answer to clause (*c*) that it was due to cholera and then again in clause (*d*) that it was due to a 'virulent type of cholera infection in the food eaten by the boarders at night'? Evidently, cholera was confined only to that area?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"I cannot say that without notice."

Mr. Champion's scheme of elementary education.

* 356 *Q*.—Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many municipal councils, district boards and educational councils have approved Mr. Champion's scheme of centralizing and consolidating elementary education; and

(*b*) whether it is the intention of the Government when the scheme is brought into operation to do away with all or any of the elementary schools maintained by the Labour department?

A.—(*a*) Local bodies which maintain elementary schools have alone been advised to prepare schemes in the light of the recommendations made in Mr. Champion's report and submit them to the Director of Public Instruction. Seventeen taluk boards and nine municipal councils have so far addressed the Director in the matter. Of these, nine taluk boards and all the municipal councils have generally approved of the recommendations in the report. No communication has been received from any District Educational Council approving of the recommendations.

(*b*) If a school maintained by the Labour department is found to be superfluous and if the pupils in that school can be provided for in any of the existing schools, its removal will be considered provided there is some guarantee that the facilities for pupils of the depressed classes will not be diminished after the Labour school has been closed.

Alleged incompleteness of the list of areas suitable for opening schools.

* 357 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that the list of places noted in Annexure B of the Director of Public Instruction's proceedings R.O.C. No. 1855-B/29, dated 19th June 1930, is incomplete with regard to Sankari Taluk Board;

(*b*) whether any correspondence has passed between the President of the Taluk Board and the Government as regards the inclusion of certain important places which he considered suitable for opening girls' schools in the list issued by the Director of Public Instruction; and

(*c*) why the suggestion of the President of the Taluk Board was not taken into consideration?

A.—(*a*) The lists of school-less centres are prepared on the basis of the population recorded in the Village Census Statistics of 1921 and in consultation with the Inspectresses of Schools. The list referred to in the question is the third list and is as complete as possible. The Director of Public Instruction proposes to revise it in the light of the census figures for 1931 as soon as they are available.

(*b*) Yes—between the President of the Taluk Board and the Director of Public Instruction.

(*c*) The centres suggested by the President of the Taluk Board, Sankari, had a population of less than 2,000 according to the census of 1921. The Government are not subsidizing local boards towards the cost of opening and maintaining girls' schools in centres with a population of less than 2,000.

31st October 1931]

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar:—"May I know whether population is the only consideration?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"Yes, Sir; under the existing rules, population is the consideration."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether there is any proposal before the Government to reduce the number of the population limit with regard to school centres?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"There is no such proposal under consideration."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"With regard to at least the backward communities, Sir?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar:—"With regard to none."

Proposed use of the buildings of the Government School of Commerce for the Training School for men, Calicut.

* 358 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the accommodation for the Government Training School for men, Calicut, is adequate;

(*b*) whether the District Educational Officer, Malabar, suggested at any time the use of the buildings of the Government School of Commerce, Calicut, for the use of the Training School for men, during the period of the day when the commercial school is not in session;

(*c*) what the hours of working of the School of Commerce are;

(*d*) what the decision of the Government is on the subject; and

(*e*) whether there is a proposal to change the working hours of the Government School of Commerce, Calicut?

A.—(*a*) The accommodation is considered fairly satisfactory.

(*b*) Yes. The Director of Public Instruction, however, was of the view that the existing accommodation will suffice for the present on the execution of certain minor improvements which have been carried out.

(*c*) The typewriting class is held from 7-45 to 10-45 a.m. and from 3-30 to 7-30 p.m. The other classes are held from 7-45 to 9-45 a.m. and from 4-30 to 7-30 p.m.

(*d*) Does not arise.

(*e*) No.

List of Government Training Schools for Women in the Presidency.

* 359 *Q.*—Mr. M. B. Rangaswami Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of Government training schools for women in this Presidency on 1st March 1931;

(*b*) the strength of the secondary, higher elementary and lower elementary training classes in each of these schools on 1st March 1931;

(c) the expenditure from Provincial funds on each of these training schools during 1930–31;

(d) the approximate cost of training a student for each of these schools for 1930–31; and

(e) whether there are any proposals for abolishing any of these schools in connexion with the proposals for retrenchment of public expenditure and amalgamating the classes in those schools with the classes of neighbouring schools?

A.—(a) *to* (d) The hon. Member is referred to the subsidiary tables at pages 130–132 of Part II of Volume II of the Report on Public Instruction for 1929–30. Information for 1930–31 is not available.

(e) The answer is in the negative.

Personnel of the Board of Examiners for Shorthand and Typewriting.

* 360 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(a) who are the members of the Board of Examiners for Shorthand and Typewriting;

(b) what is the principle underlying the selection of the Board of Examiners and the Assistant Examiners; and

(c) what are the qualifications of Assistant Examiners in each case?

A.—(a) & (c) The information asked for is confidential.

(b) When selecting examiners and assistant examiners, particular account is taken of their knowledge and practical experience, their status and their capacity to discharge the responsible work entrusted to them.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know the qualifications which decide the selection of these examiners?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Oh yes; they must have knowledge of the subjects, practical experience, and they must have the capacity to discharge their responsible work as examiners."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Is it not a fact that thoroughly unqualified people are examiners now?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"No, Sir."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—"Of the present examiners, how many are Brahmans and how many are non-Brahmans?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"I am not prepared to disclose who are all the examiners, nor can I give the communities to which they belong."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Is it a fact that not less than two have been there for seven or eight years as examiners?"

31st October 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" I cannot say ".

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Is it the policy of the Government that one or two people should have the monopoly of these examinerships ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" It is not the policy of the Government, Sir."

Government technical examinations in shorthand and typewriting.

* 361 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased—

(*a*) to place on the table of the House a statement showing the number of candidates who appeared for the Government examinations in shorthand and typewriting (both lower and higher grades) for the last ten years districtwar and the number of candidates who came out successful;

(*b*) to state the number of candidates who appeared and came out successful in the Government examinations in shorthand and typewriting (lower and higher) held in April 1931; and

(*c*) the reasons for the increase or decrease in the percentage of candidates who were successful for the last three years?

A.—(*a*) The lower and higher grades were introduced only with effect from April 1924. The printing of the statement required will be expensive. A statement in manuscript is available for inspection.

(*b*) The figures are given below:—

Subject.	Lower.		Higher.	
	Number examined.	Number passed.	Number examined.	Number passed.
Shorthand ..	702	46	118	Nil
Typewriting ..	1,918	386	217	29

(*c*) The results in 1929 were not unsatisfactory. For 1930 and April 1931 they were bad, particularly in Shorthand. The valuation was strictly in accordance with the rules and few candidates reached the required standard.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether the Government will enquire into the reasons why there has been such a huge failure, especially in shorthand? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" Yes, Sir; they have enquired. The reason that they have been able to discover is that in previous years the examiners were very lenient and this year the examiners have been strict."

[31st October 1931

Committee to draw up plans for starting the Science Institute of the Andhra University.

* 362 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state whether the Government have appointed a committee to draw up plans and make arrangements, for the starting of the Science Institute of the Andhra University next year, and if so, its constitution, terms of reference and the progress made in the work entrusted to the committee?

A.—The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether the Government will make arrangements for the technological side as early as possible, considering that this was one of the main objects with which the Andhra University was started? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" It is the business of the University to start this or any other Institute; and it is not the business of the Government to start them."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Have any proposals been received from the Andhra University or anybody else? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" No."

Expenditure on education for Muslims and depressed classes.

* 363 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) the amount of money spent by Government for Muslims, for the running of special schools and colleges and hostels and the award of scholarships to them;

(*b*) the amount of money spent by Government for the depressed classes for the running of special schools, hostels and the award of scholarships to them;

(*c*) the amount of money spent for the Kallars for running schools and awarding scholarships; and

(*d*) whether any amount is spent by Government for running schools and awarding scholarships to the Vannikula-Kshatriyas?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The hon. Member is referred to statements Nos. 75 and 78 in Part I of Volume II of the Report on Public Instruction for 1929-30. Beyond the information contained in these statements, no separate figures of the expenditure incurred on the education of Muslims and depressed classes are available.

(*c*) & (*d*) The information is not available.

Compilation of the Tamil Lexicon.

* 364 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) what is the expenditure incurred so far in compiling the Tamil Lexicon and what more would it cost to bring the work to completion;

31st October 1931]

(*b*) how many volumes will go to make up the complete Tamil Lexicon, what is the number of volumes that have so far been issued to the public and how many volumes now await printing and issue;

(*c*) whether the Lexicon is issued to the public by the Government Press and if not, by whom and why;

(*d*) how many time the work has changed publishers and sellers and why;

(*e*) whether sale agencies are paid commission depending upon their sales or whether they are paid at a flat rate; and

(*f*) whether Government have received complaints from the public regarding non-receipt of the serial issues regularly and what steps the Government have taken to stimulate sales on a business-like basis?

A.—(*a*) The expenditure incurred until the end of 1930–31 was Rs. 2·90 lakhs; the Government have no information as to what further expenditure will have to be incurred.

(*b*) There is no information as regards the first part; in regard to the remaining parts, the attention of the hon. Member is invited to the reports recorded in G.O. No. 1570, Education, dated 3rd September 1931, which has been placed at the disposal of the press.

(*c*) *to* (*f*) The copyright in the work having been surrendered to the University of Madras, the arrangements for printing and publishing the Lexicon are made by the University and not by the Government Press. The Government have, therefore, no information on the points raised in clauses (*d*) to (*f*).

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know when the compilation will be completed? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" The hon. Member must ask the University, because the University is in charge of the work. The copyright has been surrendered to the University."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know how many volumes have appeared so far? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" That information has been included in a publication which is available to the hon. Member."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know from the hon. the Minister what exactly is the expenditure on the work done so far? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—" Beyond what is found in that publication which is available to him as well as to me, I cannot give any further information; because as I said, it is the University that is in charge of the work."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know if half or quarter of the work has been done so far ? " (No reply.)

[31st October 1931

Unauthorized use of the titles of Vidwan and Siromani in Northern Circars.

* 365 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware of the fact that some people in the Northern Circars who have not passed the Government Public Examinations of Vidwan and Siromani are freely adding those titles to their names; and

(*b*) whether the Government propose to take any action to stop this malpractice?

A.—(*a*) The Government do not conduct any such examinations; nor are they aware of the existence of the practice referred to.

(*b*) Does not arise.

Excise

Report regarding illicit manufacture and sale of liquor.

* 366 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether in the case of illicit manufacture and sale of liquor the report about such illicit manufacture or sale is to be made to the Circle Inspector of Excise; and

(*b*) whether instances have been reported to the Government in which Excise officials tried to suppress such reports?

A.—(*a*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to section 38 of the Madras Abkari Act, 1886.

(*b*) A petition of May 1930 has been traced in which it was stated that Excise officers did not take due notice of reports regarding illicit sale of liquor and that they were countenancing adulteration and other irregularities. Enquiry showed that the allegations were not true.

Location of a liquor shop in Old Jalarpet, Temple Ward, Vizagapatam.

* 367 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any representations have been made to him regarding the location of a liquor shop in Old Jalarpet, Temple Ward, Vizagapatam;

(*b*) whether the Government have taken any steps to remove the said shop; and

(*c*) if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The answer is in the negative.

(*c*) Does not arise.

31st October 1931]

Agriculture

Applicants for admission to the Agricultural College.

* 368 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many candidates applied for admission to the Agricultural College this year;

(*b*) whether all the applicants were asked to appear before the Selection Committee; and

(*c*) how many of them came for interview and what was the number of candidates that were finally selected?

A.—(*a*) Three hundred and twenty-one.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) Two hundred and thirty-four and forty-five. The latter figure excludes the three seats reserved for failed students of the previous year's batch.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" May I know, Sir, whether all the applicants were called for interview without any preliminary scrutiny having been made of the applications ? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I want notice."

Age-limit for admission of students to the Agricultural College.

* 369 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there has been any age-limit for admission of students to the Agricultural College;

(*b*) whether agricultural graduates of above 25 years of age were being entertained in the Agricultural Department till last year and if so, what was the age bar provided for such appointments; and

(*c*) whether this year the Madras Services Commission has called for applications from candidates below 25 years for the posts of Agricultural Demonstrators?

A.—(*a*) Candidates must have attained the age of 17 at the time of joining College.

(*b*) Under Subsidiary Rule 8 to Fundamental Rule 10, no person whose age exceeds 25 years can be admitted in Government service without the sanction of the head of the department. This rule was embodied in the General Rules regulating the recruitment, condition of service, etc., of Subordinate Services issued in 1929, but the power of exemption exercised by heads of departments has since been withdrawn. These rules apply to the Madras Agricultural Subordinate Service.

(*c*) The Madras Services Commission called for applications from candidates born on or after 2nd October 1906.

[31st October 1931

Mr. A. B. Shetty :—" May I know whether, in view of the fact that students have undergone the course without knowing that this power of exemption will be withdrawn from the Heads of departments, Government propose to show any concession to such students? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan :—" I don't think so."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I know whether the Government have considered the advisability of raising the age of applicants from 25 to 27? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan :—" They have raised the age from 25 to 27."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I know then whether such of those as suffered from the age limitation, who have now been enabled to get into the selection, will also be given the chance of appearing before the Committee? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan :—" The matter is under consideration, Sir."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I know if the hon. the Minister is aware that the Services Commission have asked the applicants to see them on the 4th of next month? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan :—" If Government come to a decision before that, perhaps the Commission will be informed."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I know if the Government will consider the advisability of postponing the selection till all the applicants who are eligible can also be called and then holding a general selection? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan :—" The matter is under consideration."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" Will the Government consider it favourably? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan :—" No undertaking can be given, but they will consider the question."

" Activated Sludge " experiments in the Government Central Farm Estate, Coimbatore.

* 370 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) how long ago and under whose initiative the " Activated Sludge " experiments were started in the Government Central Farm Estate, Coimbatore;

(*b*) what was the capital outlay on the plant;

(*c*) whether any, and what, royalty has been paid or included in the cost;

(*d*) to what country the patent rights belong;

(*e*) what is the nature and cost of construction of buildings and accessories that have been provided;

31st October 1931]

(*f*) what have been the expenses incurred yearly on (1) the staff and (2) the running and maintenance costs of the machinery;

(*g*) whether the staff in charge of the installation has been selected from the department or recruited on special merits and whether they receive any special allowances;

(*h*) whether the Government have any contract or understanding with the suppliers of the plant for expert supervision and advice;

(*i*) what has been the yearly output of manure in tons since the plant was erected and what has been the cost of production per ton including depreciation of machinery and supervision charges;

(*j*) how the chemical analysis of this manure compares with the compost of human excreta made by municipalities; at what price per ton this manure is valued on a chemical analysis basis and what profit the Government has made by this innovation; and

(*k*) whether the plant is large enough to supply manure for all the experimental stations around the Central Farm and whether any surplus manure has been sold to the ryots and what has been the sale-proceeds realized so far?

A.—(*a*) In 1926 the Director of Agriculture suggested to Government to install an Activated Sludge plant at Coimbatore.

(*b*) & (*c*) Completion report is awaited from the Public Works Department.

(*d*) England.

(*e*) The following buildings and accessories were constructed:—

(i) Two macerating tanks;

(ii) one settlement tank;

(iii) five æration tanks;

(iv) four reactivation tanks;

(v) one effluent reservoir;

(vi) one engine-shed; and

(vii) covered and open drains to convey the sullage.

The cost will be known from the completion report which is awaited from the Public Works Department.

(*g*) The staff consists of the engine drivers and a watchman. No special allowance of any kind is paid to them.

(*h*) No.

(*f*), (*i*) (*j*) & (*k*) The plant was taken over by the Agricultural Department on 8th September 1931. It is, therefore, too early to give any information on these points.

The Agricultural Chemist will conduct experiments hereafter.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether any estimate was prepared before the work was actually started?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"I want notice, Sir."

[31st October 1931

Public Works

List of officers who pay rent to the Government for buildings occupied by them.

* 371 *Q.*—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to furnish a list of officers with pay of Rs. 1,000 and above who pay rent to the Government for the Government buildings occupied by them or on whose behalf the Government pay rent with the amount of rent paid in each case?

A.—A list [a] is attached.

Expenditure incurred on account of the pumping scheme of the Cooum River.

* 372 *Q.*—Rao Sahib C. JAYARAM NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) the expenditure incurred by the Government in each of the two years 1927–28 and 1930–31 on the pumping scheme of the Cooum River within the Madras City;

(*b*) in what stage the Cooum improvement scheme is at present; and

(*c*) the actual number of days when the pumping of sea water was resorted to in each of the last three years during each of the hot months of the year, to maintain proper depth and level for sanitary purposes?

A.—(*a*)

	Original works.	Maintenance.
	RS.	RS.
1927–28	26,186	5,258
1930–31	2,340	6,983

(*b*) All works except construction of the lock at the Elephant Gate bridge have been completed.

(*c*) 44 days in 1928 and 107 days in 1929 as shown below:—

Month.	Number of days.
1928—	
July	12
August	29
September	3
Total ...	44
1929—	
March	8
April	23
May	31
June	30
July	15
Total ...	107

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 328–331 infra.

31st October 1931]

No pumping was done in the hot season of 1930 as the pipes leading from the harbour limits on the foreshore were removed by the South Indian Railway in connexion with the remodelling of the Beach station and the diversion of the Springhaven Road.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know, Sir, with reference to the answer to clause (b), when the lock at the Elephant Gate Bridge will be completed?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Notice, Sir."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"Has the work been taken on hand?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"It is under construction."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether the Government propose to start pumping water into the Cooum at least in the year 1932?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"As soon as the South Indian Railway authorities finish their work, pumping will be restarted."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether the Government consider that the system of pumping water into the Cooum from the sea is satisfactory?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"I believe it has been satisfactory; if it is not so, we will stop it."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know what is the information which has made the Government 'satisfied' with the progress of the work—the basis on which they have come to the decision that the system has been satisfactory?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"They have found the work satisfactory; that is all." (Laughter.)

Staff employed in the Chief Engineers' offices.

* 373 *Q.*—Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to lay on the table of the House a statement of the staff employed in the offices of the Chief Engineers of the Public Works Department and state how many of them are from Andhra Desa and from other linguistic areas?

A.—A statement[a] is attached.

Veterinary Department

Admission to the Veterinary College for 1931–32.

* 374 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of candidates who applied for admission to the Veterinary College this year;

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 331 infra.

[31st October 1931

(b) the number that was called for interview; and

(c) the number that was finally selected for admission?

A.—(a) 1,073.

(b) 395.

(c) 40.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" With reference to clause (b), may I know whether the number ' 395 ' indicates the number that came for interview or the number that was called for interview? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—" I want notice."

Local Self-Government

Notice by the Collector of Guntur to the nominated councillors of the Chirala Municipality.

* 375 Q.—Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether his attention has been called to the following notice issued by the Collector of Guntur on the 29th June to certain nominated councillors of the Chirala Municipal Council:—

" When the proposal to present an address at a cost of Rs. 50 to Mr. Subash Chandra Bose of Bengal on the 1st proximo was put to vote on 27th June 1931 you left the Council saying that you will be ill-treated by the volunteers if you voted against it.

" Please explain before 5th July 1931 why Government may not be moved to take necessary action against you."

(b) on what authority and under what provision of law the Collector issued this notice;

(c) what is the nature of the ' action ' which the Collector proposed to take; and

(d) what was the information on which the Collector acted and whether that information has been proved to be false; if so, what action has been taken against the informant?

A.—(a) Government have ascertained that the Collector of Guntur issued the notice in question to two nominated councillors on 29th June 1931.

(b) There was a clique in the Chirala Municipal Council bent upon embarrassing the Municipal Chairman and Vice-Chairman in every possible manner. The Collector considered that nominated councillors should render support to the loyal elements in the Council. It was on this principle and not under any formal provision of law that the Collector interfered in this case.

(c) The Collector wanted to inform Government of any possible disloyal activities of the persons nominated by them.

(*d*) The Collector acted on the information which he got to the effect that certain nominated councillors left the hall when the question of voting an address to Mr. Subash Chandra Bose was put stating that they would be ill-treated by volunteers if they voted against it and he states that he found the information to be true. There is, therefore, no question of taking action against anybody for furnishing false information.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know if the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government has authorized the Collector of Guntur to issue the notice which he did?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"No, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know if he has since repudiated that order?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"There is no need to do so."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know if other Collectors will be empowered to issue notices of this sort?" 11-15 a.m.

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I see no need for it also, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Having regard to the fact that one Collector did issue such instructions, has the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government not thought it necessary to issue a circular to other Collectors not to interfere with the independence or discretion of the nominated members?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I do not think such a circular is necessary, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask the hon. the Minister if the Government approve the action taken by the Collector?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"It depends on the circumstances of each case, Sir. In this particular case there was no need to approve the action or otherwise. The Collector had information on which he acted."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Is the hon. the Minister sure that no other Collector issued a similar notice?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I cannot say."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"My question has not been answered, Sir. I asked the hon. the Minister to state if the Government approved of the action taken by the Collector?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The occasion for approving or disapproving did not arise."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"In this case, did it not arise?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"No."

[31st October 1931

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—" What is the opinion of the Government?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" That does not arise."

Mr. Yakub Hasan:—" What is the meaning of 'loyal' in (b) and of 'disloyal' in (c), Sir? Is it loyalty to the municipality or loyalty to any other authority?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" It is used in the sense of loyalty to the chairman and the party conducting the administration."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if the nominated members are bound in law to obey the dictates of the chairman?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" They are expected to stand by the chairman in the conduct of administration by him."

Mr. Yakub Hasan:—" Before nominating members, is the condition laid down that they should be loyal to the chairman?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" Before nominating any member, the Collector is expected to consult the chairman of the municipal council concerned."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" The Collector is said to have stated thus: 'Please explain before 5th July 1931 why Government may not be moved to take necessary action against you.' May I know what the definite action suggested by the Collector to be taken against these members is?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" No reference was subsequently made by the Collector and therefore we do not know what action he would have suggested."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—" What was the intended action that was proposed to be taken by the Collector?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" I cannot say."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if section 144 would be handy in this matter, Sir?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" That is a matter of opinion."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—" In view of the fact that the Government is not aware of the intentions of the Collector with regard to the action proposed to be taken by him, will the Government make an enquiry?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" I do not think there is any need to enquire into this matter."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Will the Government remove the nominated members who do not obey the chairman before their term?"

31st October 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"That is merely an academical question."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Having regard to the action of these persons, will the hon. Minister remove them before their normal term would expire? Why did not the Minister remove them before their term expired in view of the desertion they played?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"There is no question of removal in this matter."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Does not the hon. Minister think that the nominated members deserted the chairman?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"It may be the opinion of the hon. Member."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"May I know what the hon. the Minister's opinion is, having regard to the circular issued by the Collector to these nominated members?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"It is not necessary to give it now."

Proposed supersession of the Madura Municipal Council.

* 376 *Q.*—Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils sent a report to the Government recommending the supersession of the Madura Municipal Council;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the Government asked the Municipal Council, Madura, to show cause against the supersession;

(*c*) what the reply of the Municipal Council was and if no reply was sent, whether the Government know why no reply was sent; and

(*d*) whether the Government will be pleased to lay all the papers including the report of the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils on the table of this House?

A.—(*a*) One of the courses discussed by the Inspector was the supersession of the Municipal Council.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) & (*d*) The papers have been placed at the disposal of the Press—*vide* G.O. No. 2871, L. & M., dated 10th August 1931. A copy of the notification directing the supersession of the Municipal Council has also been laid on the table with reference to section 41 (1) of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether the report of Inspector of Local Boards will be circulated to Members who ask for it?"

[31st October 1931

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"The relevant portions of the report have already been given in an answer to a question, and copies of this have been circulated to every Member of this House."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know if before resorting to this drastic step of supersession, the Government considered other measures, for instance, whether they could not have dissolved the Council and have elections held again?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"Well, Sir, they did consider the question most anxiously, and they have stated the reasons in the Government Order on the subject."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know the reasons that prompted the Government to take this drastic step in view of the fact that they could have resorted to milder measures?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"In view of the resolution tabled on this question, I would ask hon. Members to wait for detailed information till it comes up for discussion."

Suggestions for the rearrangement of the wards of the Kumbakonam Municipality.

* 377 *Q.*—Pandit Ganala Ramamurti: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government received from the Secretary, Sri Kamakshi Vilas Reading Room Hall, Kumbakonam, a copy of the resolutions passed at its general body meeting, under the presidentship of Mr. N. Natesa Pattar on 22nd August 1931 and from R. Nagarajan, a copy of the resolutions passed at the meeting of the municipal tax-payers of the fifth ward, Kumbakonam, held on 24th August 1931, urging the Government to modify the new arrangement of wards and suggesting a different arrangement of wards; and

(*b*) what orders the Government have passed thereon?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) Does not arise.

Proposal for the abolition of the collection of professional tax by the local bodies.

* 378 *Q.*—Pandit Ganala Ramamurti: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether there is any proposal before the Government to abolish the collection of profession-tax by local bodies?

A.—There is no such proposal.

31st October 1931]

Retirement of the Manager of the Hindupur Municipality.

* 379 *Q.*—Mr. A. KONDAPPA: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Municipal Council of Hindupur passed a resolution on 16th March 1931 that the permanent manager of the office should retire from service;

(*b*) whether the Chairman, Municipal Council, issued orders directing the retirement of the permanent manager from service;

(*c*) whether the Accountant-General, Madras, raised any objection to the retirement in question on the ground that no Government sanction was obtained;

(*d*) whether the Council at its meeting held on 10th August 1931 cancelled the resolution referred to in (*a*) above;

(*e*) whether the Chairman has given effect to the resolution of the Council, dated the 10th August 1931, and restored the permanent manager to office; and

(*f*) if the Chairman has failed to restore the manager to office, whether the Government propose to take action and see that the manager is restored to office without further delay?

A.—(*a*) In the resolution referred to, the Council while revising the scale of pay of the manager permitted the then incumbent to draw Rs. 100 from 1st April 1930 on the understanding that he will retire from service from 1st April 1931.

(*b*) & (*c*) The Government have no information except that there was some correspondence on the subject between the Chairman and the Accountant-General.

(*d*) The Council modified the resolution in so far as it related to the retirement of the manager.

(*e*) & (*f*) No. The Government consider that the resolution was in excess of the powers of the Council and have asked the Council to show cause why it should not be cancelled.

Proposed construction of a new road connecting the Bombay road with the Ranipet-Kolar road.

* 380 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether a mahazar was received by him from the villagers of Puttur near Sembarayanallur, Gudiyattam taluk, North Arcot, protesting and adducing reasons against the proposed new road to connect the Bombay road with the Ranipet-Kolar road;

(*b*) why it was not proposed to improve the old connecting road;

(*c*) what would be the relative cost of laying a new connecting road and of improving or broadening the existing connecting road; and

(*d*) whether the laying of a new road would require the acquisition of wet lands on which the villagers depend for their living?

[31st October 1931

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) An extract of the report obtained from the President, District Board, North Arcot, is given below:—

"The old connecting road consists of many sharp curves. The road width is only that of a third-class road (in many places barely 30 to 33 feet in width). Even if this road is taken up, a realignment will have to be made to avoid the sharp curves and also to acquire lands on either side for forming the full width for a trunk road. There are also avenue trees planted on both sides, the rows being not far apart to admit of a trunk road being formed. One line of avenue trees will have to be cut down. Further the line passes within the home signal limits of the Tiruvalam Railway Station which would mean that the gates will be closed for long periods when the train has been signalled, or, worse still, when goods trains stop at the station and shunting operations take place. There are also a large number of road dips which will have to be converted into culverts if this alignment is to be decided on. The proposed new alignment will be 2 miles 3 furlongs shorter in length than the existing road. This also means less cost in the shape of bridges and culverts to be constructed and savings in the maintenance cost."

(*c*) The relative cost of the alternative routes has not yet been worked out in detail but from the investigation made so far, it is reported that the cost of the formation of the new road would be much less than the cost of improvements to the existing road.

(*d*) Yes.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether, in view of the answer to clause (*d*), it would not be advisable to incur the slightly extra cost of repairing the old road rather than constructing a new road?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"That aspect will be considered when the question is decided."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"Am I to understand that no definite opinion has been formed on the question?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"It is still pending with the District Board and we are awaiting their report and suggestions."

Memorial from the villagers of Kandimallayya Palli for conversion of certain foot-paths into metalled roads.

* 381 *Q.*—Pandit Ganala Ramamurti: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government received any monster petition from the villagers of Kandimallayya Palli through the trustees of the Mutt of His Holiness Jagadguru Pothuloori Veerabrahmendra Swamulu

31st October 1931]

Varu that the foot-paths from Nandyalampet to Jangammaraju Palli and from Manney Palli to Kandimallayya Palli may be converted to public metal roads;

(b) whether the Engineer of the District Board, Cuddapah, sent any report supporting this request; and

(c) what orders the Government passed thereon?

A.—(a) No such petition has been received by Government.

(b) & (c) Do not arise.

Medical

Rewards to Assistant and Sub-Assistant Surgeons in the Agency tracts.

* 382 Q.—Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) how many Assistant Surgeons and Sub-Assistant Surgeons now serving in the Agency tracts of Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts are Oriyas or persons who have learnt Oriya and received rewards from Government;

(b) how the knowledge of Oriya on the part of non-Oriya Sub-Assistant Surgeons is tested; and

(c) what the reward offered is?

A.—(a) There are no Oriya Assistant or Sub-Assistant Surgeons in the Agency tracts at present. There are two non-Oriya Sub-Assistant Surgeons who have passed the colloquial examination in Oriya and received rewards.

(b) Candidates for the colloquial examination in Oriya are required to show ability to express themselves clearly and to understand readily what is said to them on some topic connected with the duties they have to perform, so as to afford proof that they are competent to conduct such duties without the aid of an interpreter.

(c) Rs. 250.

Staff employed in the office of the Surgeon-General.

* 383 Q.—Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House a statement showing the staff employed in the office of the Surgeon-General and also state the number of men drafted from Andhra Desa and from other linguistic areas?

A.—A statement[a] furnishing the information is laid on the table of the House.

Motor Vehicles Taxation

Representation regarding the burden of provincial taxation and licence fees on buses and lorries.

* 384 Q.—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations have been made to Government regarding the burden of provincial taxation and excessive licence fees charged by certain local bodies on buses and lorries; and

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 332 infra.

(b) whether it is a fact that many buses and lorries have been withdrawn from the road as a result of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Act?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government have no information.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know, Sir, whether the Government propose to reduce the rates of provincial taxation? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" There is no such intention at present."

Mr. W. M. BROWNING:—" May I know, Sir, in view of the answer to clause (b), whether the Government are aware that over 700 buses have been withdrawn from the road since the 1st May of this year, in eighteen districts alone? "

Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG:—" Is the Government aware, Sir, that hon. Member for the information. At the same time I may inform him that the Government is collecting information on this point."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know whether the Government propose to take any action to prevent local bodies from levying excessive licence fees? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" I do not admit that the licence fees are excessive. At the same time I may say that we are considering the question."

Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG:—" Is the Government aware, Sir, that the licence fees are not to be made a source of revenue? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" It is a matter of opinion."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" Will the hon. Minister be pleased to call for information as to how many buses and lorries have been withdrawn from the road in the Presidency? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" I have already answered that question that the Government have no information."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Is the Government aware that a number of private cars also have been withdrawn from the road? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—" I thank the hon. Member for the information."

Production of registration certificate before the licensing authorities under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931.

* 385 *Q.*—Mr. F. E. JAMES: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether he is aware that the licensing authorities under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, demand the production of the Registration certificate in the case of each payment of the motor vehicle tax;

(b) the necessity for the production of this certificate at each payment;

(c) whether he has received complaints that this requirement causes considerable inconvenience to owners of motor vehicles, and in some cases seriously delays the payment of the tax; and

(d) whether he will consider increasing the number of licensing officers and improving the facilities for and simplifying the method of payment of the tax?

A.—(a) & (b) Yes. Attention is invited to section 5 (3) (a) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931.

(c) Yes.

(d) This question is under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know what necessity there is for the production of a registration certificate once the licence fee has been accepted by the Government every time the licence fee is paid? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" I have answered that question, Sir. The law as it now stands requires it. The question is being considered."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" In view of the great inconvenience that is being caused, will the Government consider the desirability of amending that section? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" I have already answered the question."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know in how many cases so far have duplicate registration certificates been obtained by reason of this provision of law? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" I have no information."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" May I know what action has been taken by the Government on the complaints received? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—" That matter is under consideration."

Public Health

Leprosy in South Kanara district.

* 386 *Q.*—Mr. M. S. Sreshta: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to give the following information—

(a) whether investigation has been made to ascertain why Sherwa in South Kanara district is badly affected by leprosy;

(b) if so, what are the results of the investigation;

(c) if there are statistics showing the incidence of leprosy at Sherwa, what are the figures for the years for which statistics are available;

(d) what is the result of the work of the Special Officer sent to Sherwa to train the local medical officer in the treatment of leprosy;

(e) what was the number of lepers treated in the local hospital;

(f) whether it is true that the treatment has been given up; and

(g) if so, for what reasons?

A.—(*a*) Yes. The station was visited by the Medical Officer in charge of leprosy propaganda and survey work.

(*b*) The Medical Officer states as follows:—

This disease which is an endemic one has probably been introduced some decades back by a leprous person and is now on the increase, but not to an alarming extent. Unhygienic conditions and ignorance of the infective stages of the disease are the chief causes of the spread in this area.

(*c*) The total incidence for Sherwa and in some of the surrounding villages within a radius of three miles is 150 for a population of 24,000. No further figures are available.

(*d*) The Special Leprosy Officer who worked in South Kanara district during the latter part of 1930 trained the medical officer in charge of the Local Fund dispensary, Sherwa, in "Leprosy, diagnosis and treatment." He opened an out-patient leprosy clinic at Sherwa and gave advice to the President, Udipi Taluk Board. He also got the leprosy clinic equipped with the necessary drugs and out-fit; and treatment was carried on in the vacant room behind the dispensary.

(*e*) The total attendance for the six months the clinic was in existence amounted to 1,150 and the total number of cases which sought treatment for leprosy was 98.

(*f*) Yes.

(*g*) The reasons given by the President, Taluk Board, Udipi, are:—

(1) The finances of the Taluk Board are too poor to bear the charges connected with the leprosy clinic.

(2) The charges should be borne by the District Board under the provisions of the Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act of 1930.

The Surgeon-General pointed out to the President, District Board, South Kanara, the advisability of providing funds for re-opening the leprosy clinic but the District Board has not so far sanctioned any funds for the purpose.

Mr. M. S. Sreshta:—"May I know what charges were incurred during the time the clinic was in existence?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"Notice."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta:—"May I know whether the District Boards cannot be compelled to provide the funds required?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu:—"No, Sir, not under the law."

Mr. M. S. Sreshta:—"If not, cannot the required funds be provided by the Government having regard to the fact that it is very necessary to eradicate leprosy in a small town like this in the whole district as there is danger of the disease spreading to the other parts of the district and even beyond it?"

31st October 1931]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I quite realize the seriousness of the situation, but that applies equally to all places which are affected with leprosy. I am afraid that under the present financial stringency, the Government cannot provide the funds."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"May I know what action Government propose to take?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I have already answered it."

Supply of drinking water to Pedda and Chinna Matams in Kandimallayya Palli, Badvel taluk.

* 387 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government received resolutions adopted by the eighth session of the Andhra Provincial Viswabrahmana Conference which was convened under the auspices of the All-India Viswakarman Liberal Federation urging the Government that water may be supplied to the Pedda and Chinna Matams in Kandimallayya Palli, Badvel taluk, Cuddapah district, from the stream near Poleramma temple through pipes; and

(*b*) what steps the Government propose to take to supply drinking water to these mutts?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) Government do not propose to take any steps in the matter.

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Withholding of tasdiks due to temples in South Kanara.

* 388 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the tasdiks due to the several temples in South Kanara have not been paid during the last three years; if so, why and at whose instance and under what powers the said amounts were withheld; and

(*b*) what are the temples, the amounts due to each and the years in which they were not paid?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) A copy [a] of the letter from the Collector of South Kanara on the subject which contains the necessary information is placed on the table. The tasdiks were withheld by the Collector for the reasons stated in his letter.

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"May I know whether the Collector stopped the payment of tasdiks at his own instance or at the instance of the President of the Committee?"

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on page 332 infra.

[31st October 1931

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" The answer is there, Sir."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know whether the Collector has taken previous care to see whether he has stopped the tasdiks of temples which do not require the appointment of a committee —temples which are managed by sole hereditary trustees? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" Notice."

Petition for handing over charge of the Kanchi Kamakshamma temple, Vizianagaram City, to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board.

* 389 Q.—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government received a petition from Mr. Kasi Ramamurti, Vice-President, the All-India Viswakarman Liberal Federation, stating that as the Kanchi Kamakshamma temple at Bondada street, Vizianagaram City, Vizagapatam district, is at present in bad management, the Hindu Religious Endowments Board may take charge of the same; and

(*b*) the result of this complaint?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) Does not arise.

Extension of the Wakf Act to the Presidency of Madras.

* 390 Q.—Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Wakf Act of 1923 (India Act XLII of 1923) has been extended to the Madras Presidency for the better management of Wakf properties of the Muslims;

(*b*) in how many districts have advisory committees been appointed;

(*c*) what the rules and regulations prescribed for their guidance are; and

(*d*) who the members of the various committees appointed are?

A.—(*a*) Yes; with effect from the 1st of January 1932.

(*b*) The Act does not contemplate the formation of any Advisory Committees.

(*c*) & (*d*) The question does not arise.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know what steps the Government propose to take in order to work the Wakf Act of 1923 ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" The Government need not take any steps. The Act itself provides that those who are interested in the wakfs may move the Courts."

31st October 1931]

Finance

Consideration of certain suggestions of Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, M.L.C., regarding retrenchment.

* 391 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Retrenchment Officer, the Retrenchment Committee and the Government have considered the suggestions made by Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed, M.L.C., communicated to the hon. the Finance Member in his letter, dated 2nd June 1931;

(*b*) if so, what was the decision arrived at and why?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The suggestions referred to by the hon. Member are as follows:—

(1) *Abolition of all duty allowances, local allowances and rent free houses.*—The Retrenchment Committee have conducted an exhaustive review of all allowances on their merits. Their proposals, which include the abolition of a number of allowances and the reduction of others, are now under the consideration of Government.

(2) *Reorganization of Revenue and Police charges so as to reduce the number of Deputy Collectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police by at least one in each district.*—Suggestions on these lines have not yet been considered either by the Retrenchment Committee or by the Government; but a report is awaited from the Board of Revenue on the possibility of reorganizing Revenue charges of all kinds, and, as regards police charges, the Inspector-General will be examined by the Retrenchment Committee.

(3) *A general cut of at least* 10 *per cent in the strength of all establishments.*—No such wholesale proposition has been considered either by the Retrenchment Committee or by Government. The Retrenchment Committee have, however, already recommended, and the Government have accepted on their merits, certain reductions of establishments in the departments whose expenditure has so far been examined and the Committee will in due course consider the question of reducing establishments in the case of other departments as they are taken up.

(4) *Reduction of establishments by retiring of men who have put in more than* 25 *years' service.*—This is not a retrenchment proposal, but a suggestion as to the manner in which retrenchment should be given effect to. The Retrenchment Committee have, however, recommended that, where reduction of establishment is necessary, it should be carried out, as far as possible, on the lines suggested. The views expressed by the Committee will be considered by Government when passing orders on individual proposals.

[31st October 1931

(5) *All selection grade appointments to be kept in abeyance.*—The suggestion will be placed before the Retrenchment Committee and will be considered by Government in due course. Meanwhile partial effect has been given to it by the order of Government declaring that all appointments made after the 15th of August are to be on a temporary basis.

B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur:—"With reference to clause (*b*), sub-clause (4), i.e., reduction of establishments by retiring of men who have put in more than 25 years' service, may I know whether the Government have considered the question of retiring men who have put in more than 25 years' service in the Medical department?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"The Government did not consider the question with special reference to the Medical department. The question is under consideration generally with reference to all departments."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know, with regard to answer to No. (1), whether the proposals include the abolition or reduction of local allowances as such?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"Yes, Sir; they do."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know if it is not a fact that the Retrenchment Committee have already made their recommendations with regard to the Medical department and they have not made this suggestion as to the retirement of Medical men who have already put in more than 25 years of service?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"The Committee have made a recommendation and they have also added a general recommendation on the subject of retiring men who have put in more than 25 years' service."

B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur:—"Has the Retrenchment Committee considered the question whether it is advisable to retire persons who have put in more than 25 years' service in the Medical Department rather than send out people who are probationers?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"I have already said that the Retrenchment Committee have not made any recommendation specially with regard to the Medical Department."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know, if this suggestion of retirement of persons of 25 years' service is acted up to, how many vacancies will be created?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"Notice."

B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur:—"Is it not in the financial interests of the Government that people of 25 years' service should be retired rather than probationers being sent out?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes:—"It may be or it may not be. The financial effect of various proposals requires examination."

31st October 1931]

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—"Has not the Government considered this question at all ?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"The Government is considering it."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether the Inspector-General of Police has since been examined by the Retrenchment Committee with reference to clause (2) ?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"Not yet."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the Government consider that, as between the two alternatives of retiring men who have put in 25 years' service and sending away new appointees, the former alternative is better ?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"That matter is under the consideration of Government."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"With regard to answer (3), may I know if the Government or the Retrenchment Committee proposes to have a sliding scale instead of 10 per cent reduction?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"Sliding scale in respect of what establishment or department ?"

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"General cut in the pay of all."

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"It does not arise on the question."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer given by the hon. Member to my question that the question is receiving the consideration of the Government, is it not a fact that, when this question of retirement of people who have put in 25 years' service is under consideration, a number of junior men have been sent away from Government service ?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I am not aware of it, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know if the reduction of the salaries of Government servants is under consideration ?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I do not think that arises from this question, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"It arises out of the question of retrenchment, Sir."

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"It does not arise from this question."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know whether, with reference to clause (3)—general cut of at least 10 per cent in the strength of all establishments—the Government have sent away new recruits, thus nullifying the recent communal Government Order?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I am not aware of it. Recruitment has been made presumably according to the rules."

[31st October 1931

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" Is it not a fact that, on account of the communal Government Order, members of communities not represented in the service have been appointed, and they are the people who are in the lower ranks of the service, and it is people who are in the lower ranks that are to be sent away? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes :—" All people in the lower ranks of the service are not people designed to be benefited by the communal Government Order.

Mr. F. E. James :—" May I ask the hon. the Finance Member whether, in view of the further saving in stationery charges, he has considered or will consider the possibility of adding to the Finance Committee the name of Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed ? (Laughter.) "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes :—" I do not suppose this question would arise."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" May I know whether, having regard to the useful work so far rendered by the hon. Member, Mr. James, on the Finance Committee, he will be considered to be a permanent member of the Finance Committee? "

The hon. the President :—" It does not arise."

Formation of Committees of the Council to examine the possibility of retrenchment in general in Government departments.

11-30 a.m. * 392 Q.—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state whether there is any proposal before the Government to set up independent committees of the Council to examine the possibility of retrenchment in general in each department of Government and to examine in particular the necessity for a number of posts in each cadre, especially in the Revenue, Judicial and Public Works departments?

A.—No.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know why the Government think that separate committees are not necessary? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes :—" I have already stated that the Government do not think it necessary."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know why, when the Government of India has done what has been asked for in this question and particularly in view of the fact that the present Retrenchment Committee has taken more than five months, the hon. Member thinks that it will not be done more expeditiously by having separate committees? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes :—" There is no reason to suppose that multiplication of committees will expedite matters at all."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I ask whether the Government is willing to co-opt members who are acquainted with the working of particular departments when questions concerning those departments come up for consideration? "

31st October 1931]

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" The Government will consider the suggestion."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask if the Government will allow the committees to take evidence from not merely Government officers but also from outside, such as retired officers who are acquainted with the internal working of these departments, as is being done by the Government of India, Sir? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" It seems to me a matter mainly for the committee to consider."

Abolition of the Board of Revenue and the Survey and Settlement departments.

* 393 *Q*.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government or the Retrenchment Officer or the Retrenchment Committee have examined the question of the abolition of the Board of Revenue and the Survey and Settlement departments as a measure of retrenchment; and

(*b*) what will be the saving effected by the abolition of the above-said two departments?

A.—(*a*) No, but Government are at present examining certain proposals from the Board of Revenue on the subject of reducing the number of survey parties, and it is understood that the Board is considering a scheme for the reduction of expenditure on Settlement. The matter has not yet come before the Retrenchment Committee.

(*b*) The hon. Member will find the information he requires on page 57 of the Civil Budget Estimate.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether the Government have any specific reasons not to abolish the Revenue Board? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know what, Sir? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" It will take too long to explain, Sir."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May we have a brief statement, Sir."

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" The present administration is indispensable."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" I want to know whether the Government received any proposals from the Board of Revenue suggesting the wholesale dismissal of the Central Survey office? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" I believe not as yet, but I want notice."

[31st October 1931

Abolition of all allowances and certain posts in other provinces.

* 394 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact and whether the Government are aware that the Governments of Bombay, Assam, Bihar and United Provinces have recommended all allowances to be abolished in the case of all gazetted officers as a first measure of retrenchment;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the aforesaid provincial Governments have also recommended the abolition of the posts of Superintending Engineers, Deputy Inspectors-General of Police, Deputy Directors of Public Health, Deputy Directors of Public Instruction, and such other intermediary posts, in addition to the reduction in the strength of several other cadres; and

(*c*) if the information asked for in (*a*) and (*b*) is not in the possession of the Government, whether they propose to call for the same and lay it on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information.

(*c*) The information will be obtained and the Government will further consider, on obtaining it, the suggestion made.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether the Government have since obtained information? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" No, Sir."

Mr. BASHEER AHMEED SAYEED:—" May I know if they have taken steps to get it? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" Yes, we have written to ask for the information."

Question of abolition of certain intermediary posts.

* 395 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have under consideration the question of abolishing intermediary posts, such as, the Superintending Engineers, Deputy Inspectors-General of Police, Deputy Directors of Public Health, Deputy Directors of Public Instruction, etc., as a measure of retrenchment;

(*b*) whether proposals on the above lines were placed before the Retrenchment Committee; and

(*c*) if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No.

(*c*) Under the procedure prescribed, the Retrenchment Committee is examining the expenditure of each department on its merits and the question whether the posts mentioned should be retained or not must depend on the nature of the work to be done in each department.

31st October 1931]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know what posts have been abolished so far?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"Notice."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Retrenchment Committee has recommended any post to be abolished so far?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"Yes, Sir; numerous posts."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether a statement of them will be placed on the table."

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"We have already placed the statement on the table?"

Consideration of the abolition of the posts of certain Deputy Collectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police.

* 396 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government or the Retrenchment Officer or ther Retrenchment Committee have examined the question of the abolition of at least one Deputy Collector in each district, one Deputy Superintendent of Police in each district and the re-organization of their divisions existing at present; and

(*b*) if so, what were the recommendations on this subject and what were the decisions arrived at by the Retrenchment Committee?

A.—(*a*) No. The question of redistributing charges in the Revenue Department is under consideration by the Board of Revenue, but it is being examined on its merits and not on the lines suggested by the hon. Member. The organisation of the Police department will shortly be examined by the Retrenchment Committee.

(*b*) Does not arise.

Consideration of the amalgamation of certain offices and the abolition of certain institutes by way of retrenchment.

* 397 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government or the Retrenchment Officer or the Retrenchment Committee have considered (i) the question of the amalgamation of the posts of the Director of Public Health with that of the Surgeon-General; and (ii) the question of the abolition of the Leather Trades Institute and the Industrial Engineers Workshop as a measure of retrenchment; and

(*b*) if so, what is the decision arrived at, and if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The Retrenchment Committee have considered the question of amalgamating the two posts of the Surgeon-General and the Director of Public Health. They have not yet considered the question of abolishing the Leather Trades Institute and the Industrial Engineers Workshop.

[31st October 1931

(b) The Committee decided that it would be unwise on administrative grounds to combine the Medical and the Public Health departments under the headship of the Surgeon-General and, therefore, recommended that the present system should be maintained. The Government have accepted the recommendation of the Committee. The retrenchment suggested in the Industries department will be considered in due course.

Retrenchment in the Forest Department.

* 398 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have considered the question of effecting retrenchment in the Forest Department and if so, on what lines;

(b) whether any recommendations as to the retrenchment in the Forest Department were placed before the Retrenchment Committee and if so, what they were; and

(c) what was the decision arrived at by the Retrenchment Committee?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The expenditure of the Forest Department has not yet been examined in detail by the Retrenchment Committee. The only point that they have considered was the possibility of temporarily closing down the Forest College; and this they decided would be impracticable, as an immediate measure of economy. The Chief Conservator has, however, made comprehensive proposals for reduction of expenditure during the current year and surrenders of just under Rs. 3 lakhs have either been made or ordered by Government, chiefly by restricting the programme of timber extraction and cutting down capital expenditure on communications and buildings to the lowest possible figure. Further avenues of retrenchment will be explored by the Retrenchment Committee in due course.

Stoppage of recruitment to permanent service pending the question of the pay of future incumbents.

* 399 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have considered the question of stopping all future appointments on a permanent basis pending the examination of the question of future pay and strength of public service;

(b) whether any recommendations have been made by the Retrenchment Officer or the Finance Committee in this behalf;

(c) if so, whether any orders have been issued by Government to heads of departments in this direction; and

31st October 1931]

(*d*) whether a copy of the orders will be placed on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) With the concurrence of the Retrenchment Committee orders were issued in G.O. No. 810, Public, dated 5th August 1931.

(*d*) The Government Order has already been published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*—See page 1023, Part I, dated 11th August 1931.

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know, Sir, whether the consideration of the future pay has been concluded or is it still under consideration?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"The matter is still under consideration."

Abolition of certain permanent and temporary appointments.

* 400 *Q*.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government or the Retrenchment Committee have considered the question of abolishing all additional, permanent and temporary appointments sanctioned during the last three years and carrying a salary of Rs. 200 and above, as a measure of retrenchment; and

(*b*) what is the total number of such appointments and what is the budget allotment therefor?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) Government have no information and do not consider that the labour involved in collecting it would be commensurate with the value of the results.

Agency Tracts

Proposal to reserve the Agency tracts as a colony for the exclusive benefit of the Europeans.

* 401 *Q*.—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Government are contemplating a scheme to set apart the Agency tracts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Godavari districts as a colony for the exclusive use of the Europeans; and

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table all the papers connected with this affair?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no such scheme under their consideration.

[31st October 1931

Irrigation

Decision of the Government regarding the Vamsadhara project.

* 402 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the decision of the Government regarding the Vamsadhara project in the Ganjam district?

A.—In accordance with the recommendation of the Committee which inquired into irrigation projects in Ganjam district the project has been abandoned. The hon. Member's attention is invited to the papers printed at pages 773–774 of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council, Volume LI, No. 7.

Progress report regarding the Tungabhadra project.

* 403 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to make a statement as to the further progress made towards the execution of the Tungabhadra project?

A.—Replies from the other Governments are still awaited.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if the Government have finally decided the site of the dam?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"No, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I take it that they have not completed the estimates yet?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"The final detailed estimates have not yet been prepared."

Extent of irrigation by the Kanigiri Reservoir in Sangam.

* 404 *Q.*—Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total acreage that was expected to be irrigated by the Kanigiri Reservoir in Sangam when the project was first brought into existence;

(*b*) the total acreage so far brought under cultivation till now in the Sangam delta;

(*c*) if the original expectations have not been fulfilled, the reasons therefor and what measures are under contemplation to improve the delta; and

(*d*) whether it is one of the subjects recently referred to the Irrigation Board for report?

A.—(*a*) 94,000 acres (first crop) and 16,026 acres (second crop).

(*b*) The area irrigated in 1929–30 was 83,652 acres first crop and 12,929 acres second crop.

31st October 1931]

(c) Several villages which were originally included in the project ayacut were not in fact brought under irrigation and after a thorough investigation the original estimate was revised in 1898 to 84,130 acres first crop and 4,500 acres second crop. The excavation of the Vidavalore channel will add 670 acres of first crop irrigation and the Vovveru channel and branches will bring in a further 1,000 acres. The natural conditions of the delta are such that no further large extension is possible.

(d) No.

Estimate for improving water-supply to the tank in Sovenahalli, Kudligi taluk.

* 405 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether an estimate for improving the supply to the tank in Sovenahalli, Kudligi taluk, Bellary district, has been prepared or is still under preparation; and, in either case, whether the estimate includes repairs to Komaranahalli supply channel which has breached in parts and, if not, why not?

A.—No estimate for improving the supply to the tank has been prepared nor is any under preparation.

Investigation of the Appapuram project by the Special subdivision.

* 406 *Q.*—Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Special Division appointed to investigate into the Appapuram project, is surveying a new line at a distance of more than three furlongs from the old line proposed by the Government at first;

(b) if so, whether the Government have instructed the Special Division to survey the new line;

(c) if so, what the instructions are; and

(d) whether the Government have assured the Appapuram Project Committee that the Special Division will consider the line suggested by the Project Committee?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government sanctioned the formation of a special division to investigate in detail, and prepare plans and estimates for the extension of irrigation in the Kistna Eastern and Western deltas. They issued no detailed instructions.

(d) No.

Paucity of irrigational facilities in Salem district.

* 407 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the district of Salem has few facilities for irrigation;

(b) whether there are abundant sources for easy irrigation; and

(c) if so, whether the Government propose to utilize them for purposes of irrigation?

[31st October 1931

A.—(*a*) Salem has one major irrigation system, 116 minor irrigation works in charge of the Public Works Department and 2,432 minor irrigation works in charge of the Revenue Department.

(*b*) No. A number of projects have been examined from time to time and found impracticable.

(*c*) One new project is now in progress, and two are under consideration.

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—" The answer to clause (*b*) is 'no'. May I know whether the attention of the hon. Member has been drawn to the various sources of irrigation referred to in Lefanoe's Manual? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" No, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member for drawing my attention to it."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" May I ask whether, in view of the fact that the Government have not found any means of further irrigation of Salem, they will extend the existing Cauvery channels? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" I am not sure whether it is possible to do so."

Failure of the supply channels from the Cauvery in Namakkal taluk.

* 408 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was total failure of water-supply in the channels (leading from the Cauvery) in Namakkal taluk of Salem district for more than 20 days at a stretch;

(*b*) whether huge losses have been incurred by the ryots on account of this failure; and

(*c*) whether the Government contemplate to enquire into the matter and take immediate steps to redress the grievances of the distressed ryots and grant a generous remission in the land-tax?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information.

(*c*) The Government do not consider it necessary to order any special enquiries as the matter can be dealt with by the local officers under the ordinary rules in the Board's Standing Orders.

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—" With regard to (*a*) and (*b*), the Government say they have no information. Will they be pleased to call for the information? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" Yes, Sir."

Supply of water from Mettur dam to Salem and Coimbatore districts for irrigation.

* 409 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have taken or propose to take any steps regarding the supply of water for

31st October 1931]

Salem and Coimbatore districts from Mettur dam for irrigation purposes, after the cut motion was carried in the Council on 16th March last?

A.—No.

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar :—" May I know why no action was taken?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" Orders on the question have either been published in the Press or placed on the table of this House."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" The question refers to Salem and Coimbatore districts. May I ask the Government to state whether they do not propose to give further irrigation facilities to the Coimbatore district? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" Not under the Mettur project."

Agreement between Government and the ryots of the Vadavar Ayacut.

* 410 *Q.*—Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there was any agreement entered into between the Government on the one hand and the ryots of the Vadavar ayacut on the other between the years 1800—1840; and

(*b*) if so, what were the terms of the agreement and whether a copy of the agreement will be placed on the table?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have called for a report.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know whether the report has since been received? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" No, Sir."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" Will he expedite it, Sir? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" It will take some time to search for the papers. We have had reports that no agreement can be found in the Madras Records office, or in the Superintending Engineer's office or in the Executive Engineer's office. We are awaiting reports from the Collectors."

Clearance of silt in the Buckingham Canal.

* 411 *Q.*—Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total expenditure incurred in each of the last three years, (i) on the clearance of silt from the Buckingham Canal and (ii) the other improvements to the sections of the said canal situated (1) to the south of Madras and (2) to the north of Madras;

(*b*) the length of the section of the said canal situated to the north of Madras and south of Madras;

[31st October 1931

(*c*) whether any petitions were received by the Government from the boat owners' associations or others complaining about the shallowness of the canal especially in the southern section causing delay in the transit of boats loaded with cargo and fuel consigned to Madras; if so, how many in each of the years 1928, 1929 and 1930;

(*d*) what action the Government had taken thereon;

(*e*) whether the Government have enquired as to the condition of the canal for purposes of navigation; if not, what they propose to do for improving the condition of the navigation in the said canal; and

(*f*) whether any proposal was ever made recently or in the pre-Reform days for extending the canal from the Markanam end to the districts of South Arcot and Tanjore and if so, with what result?

A.—(*a*) (i) The Government have not figures of the expenditure on the clearance of silt separately, but the total expenditure on maintenance and repairs, in which the clearance of silt is included, has been as follows in the last three years:

	RS.
1928–29	2,64,057
1929–30	2,27,329
1930–31	2,47,262

(ii) (1) & (2) The expenditure incurred on extensions and improvements to both the south and north canals is

	RS.
1928–29	24,832
1929–30	31,450
1930–31	3,947

Separate figures for south and north canals are not available.

(*b*) 196 miles and 66 miles, respectively.

(*c*) Four petitions were received between 1928 and 1930 dealing, among other things, with clearance of silt.

(*d*) So far as the shallowness of the canal was concerned, estimates amounting to Rs. 1·92 lakhs were sanctioned in 1928 for deepening the Junction and South Canals, but, as the Chief Engineer reported that the work done to the value of about Rs. 60,000 was infructuous owing to heavy springs and lightness of the soil of the bed, further work was stopped.

(*e*) Yes. No improvements other than annual maintenance including the clearance of silt are contemplated.

(*f*) The proposal was considered several times in the past, but it was decided that it was impracticable and prohibitively expensive.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May we know the income that is derived from the Buckingham canal?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I must ask for notice."

31st October 1931]

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" May I know who is responsible for the waste of Rs. 60,000 over a work which was found to be infructuous? It is said that the work done to the value of about Rs. 60,000 was infructuous owing to heavy springs and lightness of the soil of the bed. Why did not the Chief Engineer consider this before wasting Rs. 60,000? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" I do not think it could be known to anybody that these springs existed to the extent to which they did or that their effect would be so great as to affect the work that was done."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" May I ask what the reference to the spring is? It is apparent that the Chief Engineer adopted the particular method of carrying out the work, apparently by pumping out water. Is it not possible to dredge the canal ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" As earth is removed, mud comes up from underneath."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—" To get over the difficulty of springs, the question is whether it could not be dredged."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" I will ask for a report on the suggestion."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan :—" My question is, have all these been not examined before launching on the scheme ? "

Land Revenue Administration

Failure to pass the equitation test a bar to promotion as Deputy Collector.

* 412 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether any Sub-Magistrates or Tahsildars have been debarred from promotion to the rank of Deputy Collectors on the mere ground that they have failed to pass the horse-riding test;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that most of the Deputy Collectors never maintain or use a horse after they pass the riding test; and

(*c*) whether the Government have at any time been asked to consider the question of abolishing the equitation test as a compulsory test for Deputy Collectors?

A.—(*a*) No person is eligible for selection for admission to the Madras Civil Service (Executive Branch) by promotion from the Madras Revenue Subordinate Service unless among other qualifications he has passed the Equitation Test.

(*b*) The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested.

(*c*) The answer is in the negative.

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar :—" If any representation has been received, will the Government consider it now ? "

[31st October 1931

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"No, Sir; we consider it necessary for these officers to pass the equitation test."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—"In these days of speedy motors, is horse riding necessary?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"Yes."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—"Are Deputy Collectors using animals at present?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I hope so, Sir."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—"Have Government called for information on this matter?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I have not called for information."

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—"What is the necessity for this test in these days of rapid motors?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"These officers should visit places which cannot be reached by motor cars or motor cycles."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask if a horse is not a necessity?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"Yes, though the necessity varies in different districts."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"Is it a fact that nobody maintains a horse? What is to become of the test then?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"Some time or other they may have to use the horse."

B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur:—"Is horse-riding a test for appointment as members of the Executive Council?" (Laughter.)

Muslims as Tahsildars.

* 413 *Q.*—Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there are Muslim Tahsildars now working in the districts of Kurnool, Guntur, Kistna, West Godavari, Vizagapatam and Ganjam, and if so, for how many years; and

(*b*) whether there are any qualified Muslims available in the abovesaid districts for employment as Tahsildars?

A.—(*a*) The Government have no information other than that contained in the Revenue Establishment Lists corrected up to 1st April 1931 which are available in the Legislative Council Library.

(*b*) The Government have not the information.

Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig:—"Is the Government satisfied that Muslims are adequately represented in these districts?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I have not examined the question."

31st October 1931]

Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig :—" Will the Government examine it?"

•The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" No, Sir. In cases where there is a preponderance of any particular community, the preponderance will be corrected in due course by recruitment under the communal rotation rule, but promotion within a service is not usually affected by communal considerations."

Transfer of the proprietary estates of Bhadrachalam and Rekapalle to British possession.

* 414 Q.—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) when the proprietary estates of Bhadrachalam and Rekapalle came into British possession; and

(b) what the peshkash of the estate was at first, and how often it was enhanced afterwards, when and why?

A.—(a) In the year 1860.

(b) A summary settlement was made in 1861 and the amount of peshkash was fixed at Rs. 9,500. A regular settlement was made in 1867. This was revised subsequently on two occasions, viz., in the years 1890 and 1922. The revisions were made in accordance with the settlement rules in force in the Central Provinces, to which these areas originally belonged. Under these rules the revenue payable by the proprietors to the Government is increased or decreased in proportion to the total rent payable to the proprietor.

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" May I know from the hon. the Revenue Member the extent of the savings anticipated?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" I must ask for notice."

Proposal to apportion Sathiavedu to Ponneri and Tiruvallur taluks.

* 415 Q.—Mr. V. T. Arasu : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal now before the Government to abolish Sathiavedu, in Chingleput district, as a separate sub-taluk and apportion it to Ponneri and Tiruvallur taluks; and

(b) if so, what are the reasons that impelled Government to take such a step?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The proposal is under consideration as a measure of retrenchment.

Extent of dry lands in South Kanara.

* 416 Q.—Mr. A. B. Shetty : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total area of land classified as ' dry ' or ' punja ' land in South Kanara;

[31st October 1931

(b) what extent of the above land has so far been given on darkhast;

(c) what is the area of dry land under ragi cultivation; and

(d) what is the basis on which dry lands are assessed in South Kanara?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have not the information.

(c) The Government have no separate information as regards dry land. According to the season and crop report for fasli 1339 the total area under ragi cultivation in the district was 6,536 acres in that fasli.

(d) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the notification for the settlement of the South Kanara district which was published in the District Gazette of that district for the month of November 1902. Relevant extracts[a] from the notification are attached.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" May I know whether it is a fact that ragi cultivation is done only in very small portions of the dry land area in South Kanara? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—" The information is given in answer to clause (c). According to the Crop Report for fasli 1339 the total area under ragi cultivation in the district was 6,536 acres."

Minor Irrigation

Supply of water to certain tanks in Alangayam village.

* 417 Q.—Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a chain of tanks from below Pudieri and Periyeri tanks in Alangayam village, Tiruppattur taluk, North Arcot;

(b) whether they are only rain-fed tanks and whether for the past few years owing to the failure of rains the tanks had no sufficient water for irrigation;

(c) what is the amount of remission granted to Alangayam for the past six years; and

(d) whether the Government contemplated a scheme of diverting the waters of a jungle stream into the tanks in and around Alangayam village?

A.—(a) to (d) A copy[b] of a report received from the Collector of North Arcot on the subject is attached.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix V on pages 333–334 infra.
[b] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 334—336 infra.

31st October 1931]

Public Service

Employment of the subjects of Indian States by the Government of Madras.

* 418 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a considerable number of Travancoreans, Cochinites and Mysoreans are employed in the Medical, Educational, and other departments under the Government of Madras;

(*b*) whether such non-Madrasis are eligible for all appointments under the Madras Government; and

(*c*) whether Government have taken any steps to ensure reciprocal treatment of Madrasis by these States?

A.—(*a*) A certain number of subjects of Indian States are so employed. The exact number is not known.

(*b*) No subject of a State in India can be employed without the previous sanction of the Local Government which is given only in exceptional circumstances when qualified and suitable British subjects are not available.

(*c*) No.

Mr. A. B. Shetty:—" May I know why Government have not taken any steps to ensure reciprocal treatment of Madrasis by these States? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—" I do not think it necessary for the Madras Government to see that the subjects of this Presidency are not employed in the Indian States unless it is not possible to obtain the services of qualified and suitable subjects of the State."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" May I know with reference to clause (*b*) whether Government has put this embargo on all appointments even in lower grades? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" What steps does the Government usually take to find out whether an applicant is a British subject or not?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—" It is a matter for enquiry by the appointing or selecting authority."

B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur:—" What is the ground on which the Government gives sanction for appointment of a non-British subject? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—" That is stated in the answer, viz., when qualified and suitable British subjects are not available."

Posts advertised for and the applications received by the Madras Services Commission in the course of this year.

* 419 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) to what all posts the Madras Services Commission has invited applications in the course of this year;

[31st October 1931

(*b*) how many applications they have received for each of these posts;

(*c*) how many candidates appeared for competitive examinations or came for interviews in each of these cases; and

(*d*) what number was finally selected in each case?

A.—(*a*) to (*d*) Government have no information in the matter. The hon. Member is requested to await the publication of the reports of the Madras Services Commission for 1930–31 and 1931–32.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know whether the Government cannot call for the information? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" I am unable to call for a report in anticipation of a general report which will be received in due course, as it will cause considerable trouble to save a small delay."

Cinchona

Quinine output by the departmental plantations.

11-45 a.m. * 420 *Q.*—Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what is the quinine output from the bark obtained **from the** departmental plantations during the years 1928, 1929 and 1930; and what is the cost per lb. and how the price compares with the imported quinine; and

(*b*) what is the quantity of bark purchased from others during the years 1928, 1929 and 1930 and how the quinine contents compared with the departmental bark?

A.—(*a*) The quinine output from the plantations is as follows:—

	LB.
1928–29	8,676
1929–30	5,770
1930–31	8,005

The cost per pound is Rs. 15 including overhead charges. The cost of imported quinine is Rs. 18 per pound. The Government quinine is sold at the same rate as that of imported quinine.

(*b*) The quantity of bark purchased during the past three years, is as follows:—

	LB.
1928–29	268,421
1929–30	325,220
1930–31	423,368

Most of this bark comes from high grade ledger bark grown on a private plantation in the Anamalais now converted into a tea estate. The average quinine content is 6 per cent against the average content of Nilgiris plantation bark of 4 per cent.

31st October 1931]

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—" In view of the large output of cinchona bark and better quinine contents of the bark obtained in the Anamalais, does not the Government think it advisable to encourage private agencies to grow cinchona? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The private agencies are now turning to tea cultivation."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—" If private agencies are given a higher rate of price, I am sure private agencies will come forward to take up cinchona plantation? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I thank the hon. Member for his information."

Electricity

Charges for electricity supplied by the Madras Electric Supply Corporation, Ltd., to the Government.

* 421 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the amount paid by the Madras Government to the Madras Electric Supply Corporation, Ltd., for the energy supplied by them to the Government buildings during the last year;

(*b*) the rate charged by the company per unit;

(*c*) the reasons why the Government have agreed to a higher rate than that obtaining in Bombay, Calcutta or Rangoon;

(*d*) whether the question of the reduction in the rate charged for electricity supplied by the Madras Electric Supply Corporation, Ltd., was ever considered and, if so, when and with what results;

(*e*) the name and description of meters that are used for calculating the current consumed and their respective actual costs and the charge levied per month for meters supplied by the Corporation; and

(*f*) whether the Madras Electric Supply Corporation, Ltd., furnishes every year to the Government of Madras its annual report on the working of the Company?

A.—(*a*) The exact amount paid by the Madras Government has not been ascertained but Rs. 4,07,776–12–6 was paid for energy supplied to all Government buildings including those belonging to the Government of India.

(*b*) 3·5 annas.

(*c*) The Government have no information as to the rates now charged at Calcutta, Bombay or Rangoon, but at the time the present rate (which was a reduction on the old rate) was agreed to the latest information available was that Calcutta paid 1·9 annas, Bombay 3·06 annas and Rangoon 3·5 annas per unit. The variation of rate depends upon a variety of conditions.

[31st October 1931

(*d*) Yes, in 1928 and 1929, so far as the charge for Government buildings is concerned and a flat rate of 3·5 annas per unit was agreed to for three years from 1st January 1930.

As regards rates charged to the public the Government decided in 1928 that no reduction was called for.

(*e*) The Government have no information.

(*f*) Yes.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know whether Government is not aware that the Madras Electric Supply Corporation is giving a lesser rate to private companies consuming a large number of units? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I know that they regulate the rates according to the quantity consumed."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" When Government is consuming a large amount of current, why are they not getting that concession? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" We have got that concession which depends on the quantity consumed by us."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know whether some private companies are not paying much less than what the Government is paying? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not aware."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" In view of the fact that in Calcutta the rate charged is 1·9 annas per unit, have Government satisfied themselves that the rate which the Madras Electric Supply Corporation is charging Government, viz., 3·5 annas per unit, is not too high? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The conditions in different cities are different."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" May I know how long this agreement with the Electric Corporation entered into in 1928 should continue and how long the present rates will continue? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The rates payable by private consumers are under consideration."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I am very glad that they are under consideration, having regard to the representation made by the public both to the Corporation and through newspapers. Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to consider the advisability of reducing the rates? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am sorry I cannot give a definite undertaking. But I can give this assurance that, as I said, the question of rates will be carefully considered."

31st October 1931]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know whether, as a measure of retrenchment, the Government will not think it desirable to reduce the rates they are now paying? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The question of retrenchment has nothing to do with the rates payable to others."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" May I know if the public will be taken into confidence in considering the rates the company will be allowed to charge? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I shall consider my hon. Friend's suggestion."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" In clause (*c*) of the answer, it is said ' the variation of rate depends upon a variety of conditions.' May I know some of the varying conditions?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" For instance, the extent of consumption, the facilities which the suppliers have, the facilities which the consumers have and many other conditions."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I know whether Government are aware that, if they reduce the rate by one anna or half an anna, half a lakh of rupees will be saved from the amount they are now paying? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not aware of that."

Use of teak poles for transmission lines from Pykara to other distributing centres.

* 422 *Q*.—Mr. YAKUB HASAN : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have taken up the question of using teak poles for the transmission lines from Pykara to the various distributing centres and also within the areas which actually receive the power;

(*b*) whether the Government are contemplating the use of steel poles;

(*c*) whether there is any proposal to insist in future that all licensees should use only teak poles for transmission lines as has been done at Calicut; and

(*d*) what would be the saving in expenditure if teak is substituted for steel for the transmission lines from Pykara?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The question has been considered by the Chief Engineer for Hydro-electric development. It is not proposed to use teak poles for transmission lines as the cost of teak poles including transportation and erection charges is higher than that of steel poles of equivalent strength and longer life, and steel affords a better protection against interruptions to the service due to lightning.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) The cost would be higher.

[31st October 1931

Mr. Yakub Hasan :—" Are the Government aware that the Mysore Government is using teak poles for transmission lines ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" My information is otherwise, namely, that the Mysore Government is generally using steel poles, and teak poles only on insignificant lines. On all important lines they are using steel poles."

Mr. Yakub Hasan :—" Why should they use teak poles on insignificant lines? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" Because probably, the cost of transport of teak poles is not heavy."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" May I know whether the steel poles are indigenous or foreign ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" As far as I am aware, teak poles are indigenous; no teak is imported from outside."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" I beg your pardon. I am afraid I did not make myself heard. I was referring to steel poles."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" I want notice."

Mr. Yakub Hasan :—" The cost of steel pole given here is the same as the cost of teak pole. Is it that longer life has been taken into account? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" Yes, longer life and protection against interruptions due to lightning, as is referred to in the answer."

Law Department

Appointment of a temporary Assistant Secretary for Law (Drafting) Department.

* 423 *Q.*—Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a temporary Assistant Secretary for drafting has been appointed by the Government to be in charge of the Estates Land Act (Amending Bill) and if so, what are his pay and allowances and for what period he has been appointed; and

(*b*) what is the nature of the work that is proposed to be done by him?

A.—(*a*) An Assistant Secretary has been appointed to give relief to the Under Secretary (Drafting) whose work has been on the increase since 1929 and has been particularly heavy since the beginning of this year. The appointment of the Assistant Secretary is not solely for the Estate Land Act (Amendment) Bill. His salary is Rs. 500. No allowances are granted to him. The appointment is for a period of six months.

31st October 1931]

(b) It is intended that he should be responsible for such portion of the work of the Law (Drafting) Department as may be assigned to him from time to time by the Under Secretary, Law (Drafting) Department.

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA:—" My question was whether the Assistant Secretary was appointed to be in charge of the Estates Land Act (Amending Bill). May I know whether that was not the principal object and whether the appointment was not made in that connexion? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" No, Sir. It was in connexion with the heaviness of work in that section."

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA:—" When was the appointment made and what is the work entrusted to the Assistant Secretary? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" The appointment was made some time ago, and the work to be done by the Assistant Secretary, as is stated in one of the answers, is regulated by the Under Secretary."

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA:—" What is the date of appointment? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Notice."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know what was the heaviness of work due to?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" That section has to deal with many rules under the Acts, and recently it had to deal with many Bills."

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA:—" Who is the person appointed and what are his qualifications? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" He is, I believe, an M.A., and an M.L."

Forests

Forest grievances of the ryots of Harur, Salem district.

* 424 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the ryots of the taluk of Harur in Salem district held a conference at Thirthamalai on 9th September 1928 and passed some resolutions regarding their difficulties in forest matters and communicated them to the Collector and to the Government; and

(b) what action has been taken in the matter; if not, why not?

A.—(a) No resolutions have been received by Government.

(b) Does not arise.

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—" May I know, Sir, whether the resolutions have been received at least by the Collector of Salem? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I do not know."

[31st October 1931

Representations from the ryots of Salem district regarding forest grievances.

* 425 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any representations from the ryots in Salem district regarding their grievances relating to reserve forests, under the forest department, as well as those under the forest panchayats; and

(*b*) if so, what action do they propose to take on them?

A.—(*a*) A petition has been received from the ryots of Hosur taluk.

(*b*) It is under the consideration of Government.

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—" May I know, Sir, from which place in Hosur the said petition has been received?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Yes, a petition has been received as stated in the answer."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—" My question is from which places in Hosur taluk, the said petition has been received?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" From the places referred to by my hon. Friend."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether the grievances have been redressed?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" As I said, the petition is under consideration."

Petitions for the disafforestation of portions of the Thoppur Reserve, Salem district.

* 426 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the people of Dhombarakampatti and surrounding villages have submitted petitions to Government for disafforesting portions and assigning lands for cultivation in Thoppur reserve forest and Dhombarakampatti reserves in Salem district; and

(*b*) whether a copy of the order in this matter passed by the Chief Conservator of Forests will be placed on the table?

A.—(*a*) A petition for the lease of about 1,340 acres of land in the Thoppur and Barigam B reserved forests was received.

(*b*) The copy of the relevant portion of the order is "The areas applied for will not be disreserved."

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDAR:—" May I know, Sir, the reasons which led the Conservator of Forests pass such an order?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Because it is not in the interests of the Forest department to disafforest those areas."

31st October 1931]

Rates fixed for grazing permits in Salem district.

* 427 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what were the grazing rates originally fixed by the Government in various forest areas in Salem district; and

(*b*) whether the rates have been increased subsequently, and if so, by how much?

A.—(*a*) In 1890, the following rates of grazing fees were fixed as a maximum, subject to the condition that only half the rates should be the maximum for agricultural cattle:—

	AS.
Buffaloes	8
Bulls, cows, etc.	4
Sheep and goats	2

In 1895, the above differentiation between the agricultural cattle and others was abolished and the following uniform rates were prescribed, viz.—

	AS.
Buffaloes	6
Bulls, cows, etc.	3
Sheep and goats	$1\frac{1}{2}$

(*b*) The rates have since been revised according to local conditions. A statement[a] showing the existing rates is appended.

Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar:—"May I know, Sir, the reasons for raising the rates of grazing fees to more than double or treble the old rates?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"It was raised in the interests of good cattle and also in the interests of the forests."

Wages paid to the aborigines employed by forest officials in Nugur and Bhadrachalam taluks.

* 428 Q.—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the arrangements in force for the forest officials in Nugur and Bhadrachalam taluks of Godavari Agency to obtain the necessary labour for work in forests, etc., in their respective charges;

(*b*) whether the aborigines are required to furnish the labour needed by the forest officials; if so, under what conditions and on what terms; and

(*c*) the scale of wages paid to the aborigines when employed by the forest officials?

[a] Printed as Appendix VII on page 337 infra.

[31st October 1931

A.—(*a*) The following arrangements are in force:—

The forest subordinates apply to the headman or patel of the village and the latter arranges the requisite labour. During the time of harvest the patel raises a party at the rate of one for each kamatham (a group of two or three families formed for the purposes of cultivation). The wages of all the labourers from a village were being paid to the patel until last year. But as this system of paying wages to the patels did not work satisfactorily, the system of paying each individual is being introduced in some places as an experimental measure. In apportioning the work among the several villages, care is taken not to indent on a single village for too much labour.

(*b*) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(*c*) Generally the labourers are paid on the quantity or outturn basis. But in a few cases daily wages are paid at the rate of four annas per male and three annas per female.

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" In view of the fact that the wild tribes in these districts are asked to do forced labour and they are not often paid any wages at all, will Government be pleased to make an enquiry considering the desirability of stopping this forced labour? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" There is no forced labour."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—" Have the Government made enquiries? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" The Government are aware that there is no such thing as forced labour."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" With reference to the answer to clause (*a*), are we to take it that the system of paying for compulsory labour is going to be introduced throughout this Presidency? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" We are not here concerned with the Presidency as a whole but with the particular forest area."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—" I am asking whether a similar system will be adopted in other parts of the Presidency? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" That has nothing to do with the present question."

Alleged exaction of forced labour from the aborigines by the forest officials of Nugur and Bhadrachalam taluks.

* 429 *Q.*—Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is not a fact that the forest officials in Nugur and Bhadrachalam taluks of Godavari Agency exact forced labour from the aborigines at a low wage of annas 8 per week; and

31st October 1931]

(b) whether the Government are taking any steps to put an end to this system?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Prisons

Alleged grievances of Mr. S. Srihari Rao in Vizagapatam jail.

* 430 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Mr. S. Srihari Rao who is now in Vizagapatam jail was treated as a special class prisoner before he was transferred to Vizagapatam and whether after he was transferred, the same treatment has been withdrawn and he is treated as an ordinary criminal; if so, why so;

(b) whether he is placed or was placed in a cell in solitary confinement in Vizagapatam jail; if so, why; and

(c) whether he has been on hunger-strike; if so, for how many days; and what is his condition; and whether the Government have investigated into the grievances which had to his hunger-strike; and what is its result, if any?

A.—(a) The prisoner has been throughout treated as an ordinary C class prisoner.

(b) The prisoner was locked up in the day time in a separate block outside the quarantine in order to prevent other prisoners being instigated by him to disobey orders.

(c) He was on hunger-strike for 66 days and his present general condition is reported to be good. The grievances which led to the hunger-strike were enquired into and the Government are satisfied that the prisoner is not entitled under the rules to the concessions claimed by him.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know, Sir, the actual necessity which led the Government to keep this prisoner in a separate block? The answer given is, 'in order to prevent other prisoners being instigated by him to disobey orders.' I want to know whether there was any such case due to which he is kept in a separate block."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"What was the case?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Because it was found actually that he was instigating others to disobey orders."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"What is it that he did?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"What he did was that he was instigating other prisoners to disobey orders."

[31st October 1931

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—"The answer to clause (c) is, 'The grievances which led to the hunger-strike were enquired into and the Government are satisfied that the prisoner is not entitled under the rules to the concessions claimed by him.' What are the concessions claimed by him to which the Government says he is not entitled?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"He claimed all the concessions of an A class prisoner."

Depressed Classes

Acquisition of a strip of land for the extension of a pathway for the benefit of the Adi-Dravidas of Gopalasamudram.

*431 Q.—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Adi-Dravidas living in Panchama School street, Gopalasamudram, Tinnevelly district, applied to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Shermadevi, to the District Labour Officer, and District Collector, Tinnevelly, for the extension of their street to the main road by acquisition of a strip of land measuring 4 cents in S. No. 284/4 of the said village;

(b) if so, for how long they have been making that request;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Union Board, Gopalasamudram, passed a resolution on 20th January 1928 to the effect that a pathway should be acquired for the Adi-Dravidas;

(d) whether the said resolution was communicated to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Shermadevi;

(e) what was done thereupon;

(f) whether Rs. 39-1-7 and Rs. 2-4-10 were received from the Adi-Dravidas by the Government on 14th April 1920 and 18th October 1921, respectively, towards the acquisition of the land for the extension of the street;

(g) whether it is a fact that a further instalment of money was also required to be paid by the Adi-Dravidas in 1929; and

(h) why the acquisition has not yet been made?

A.—(a) to (h) The Government have no information but are making enquiries.

Factories

Extension of the provisions of the Indian Factories Act to private workshops.

* 432 Q.—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in view of the recent Labour Commission's enquiry presided over by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Whitley, the Government of India circularized to the local Governments that Labour legislation may be extended to various private workshops where work in wood, ivory, stone, engineering, iron, steel, brass, bell-metal, copper, silver, gold and other metals is being carried on and whether they have called for the opinion of the local Governments as to the advisability of bringing these workshops also under the operation of the

31st October 1931]

Indian Factories Act as seasonal factories, e.g., factories using no power but employing substantial number of workers; and

(b) whether any and what steps the Government have taken on the same?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"May I know from the hon. the Home Member whether the answer given to clause (a) is correct?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"May I know from the hon. the Home Member whether it is not a fact that the Royal Commission on Indian Labour has made definite recommendations suggesting to the local Governments that legislation should be passed on certain lines?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"The Whitley Commission's report is under the consideration of the Government at present."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"I am asking, Sir, whether the Royal Commission has made any recommendations suggesting legislation to be undertaken by local Governments in this matter."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"That answer is to the question whether the Government of India circularized to the local Governments."

Representation of the All-India Viswakarman Liberal Federation for official recognition.

* 433 Q.—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation that the All-India Viswakarman Liberal Federation may be recognized as the central organization for the promotion of the innate talent and welfare of the employees in the various private workshops where work in wood, ivory, stone, engineering, iron, steel, brass, bell-metal, copper, silver, gold and other metals is being carried on; and

(b) if so, what action they have taken thereon?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

General

Instructions by the Government to the district officers to treat the Congress organizations as enemies of the Government.

* 434 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether before or after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, the Government issued instructions to any district officers to treat the Congress organizations as enemies of the Government, and if so, when and to whom and why?

A.—No.

[31st October 1931

Breach of Gandhi-Irwin Pact by Government subordinates.

* 435 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the Government have, on enquiry, found any actual breach of any of the terms of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact and whether the Government have in such cases drawn the attention of their subordinates to avoid such breach?

A.—The breaches of the settlement brought to the notice of the Government have been mainly by persons picketing shops. In cases in which any Government officer has misinterpreted the orders relating to the observance of the settlement his attention has been drawn to the matter.

Circular by the Collector of Chittoor regarding Congress activities in the Chandragiri taluk.

* 436 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the circular (copy) annexed herewith) was published by the District Collector of Chittoor and distributed in the Chandragiri taluk by the Tahsildar;

(*b*) under whose instructions was the circular issued;

(*c*) from what material was the information contained in the circular drawn; and

(*d*) whether any oral instructions were conveyed by the Collector of Chittoor or the District Superintendent of Police to all their officials or subordinates in the district to prevent Congressmen from holding meetings, processions or propaganda?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The circular [a] in question was not published by the Collector of Chittoor. It was issued by the Tahsildar of Chandragiri to the village officers of his taluk on his own authority.

(*c*) The circular was based on an order issued by the Collector to Magistrates as to the action to be taken in certain eventualities.

(*d*) No.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"It is said that the Tahsildar of Chandragiri was responsible for the issue of that circular. May I know if the Government are satisfied that the circular was issued without the sanction of the Collector of Chittoor?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir. The Government are satisfied."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 338 infra.

31st October 1931]

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know whether any disciplinary action was taken against this Tahsildar for having issued a circular without the Collector's sanction?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Government have adversely commented on the conduct of the Tahsildar."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Have the Government heard that any disciplinary action was taken in his case?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"It is said that the circular issued was based on an order of the Collector to Magistrates as to the action to be taken in certain eventualities. How did the Collector foresee these eventualities?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"At the time when Mr. Gandhi refused to go to the Round Table Conference, the District Magistrate thought that there might be a resumption of the civil disobedience movement and a definite breach of the Pact, and so he issued those orders."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Did the Collector's circular say that Congressmen should be treated as enemies to the Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I do not remember. Perhaps he has said so."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—"Does the Government think that the Collector was right in thinking that the Pact would be broken when Mr. Gandhi refused to go at first?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"In case there was a resumption of the civil disobedience movement, he wanted his officers to be ready prepared."

Issue of an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, by the Sub-Magistrates of Chittoor, Tirupati, Puttur and Kuppam.

* 437 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the orders under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code by the Sub-Magistrates of Chittoor, Tirupati, Puttur and Kuppam, to prevent the hoisting of the new national flag were issued on or about 30th August 1931 under instructions of the District Magistrate, Chittoor;

(*b*) whether identical information was laid before each of the sub-magistrates referred to in clause (*a*); and

(*c*) whether the orders issued by the various sub-magistrates referred to in clause (*a*) are all copies of the draft order circulated by the District Magistrate for the information and guidance of the sub-magistrates concerned?

[31st October 1931

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The District Magistrate did not issue specific instructions to each of the Sub-Magistrates mentioned to prohibit the hoisting of the National flag. The District Magistrate decided that in view of the circumstances of the situation it was undesirable to allow the flag-hoisting ceremony to proceed in places where it was likely to endanger the public peace. The Sub-Magistrates were accordingly instructed that if, on the application of the Police, they found it necessary to prohibit the ceremony, they should issue an order on the lines of that drafted by the District Magistrate for their guidance.

Alleged instructions to local authorities to prevent the flag-hoisting ceremony.

* 438 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government issued any instructions to the local authorities to prevent flag-hoisting ceremony on the 30th August; if so, the reasons therefor;

(*b*) whether the flag-hoisting ceremony was observed in all parts of the Presidency except Chittoor district; whether it was prevented in those parts of the Presidency;

(*c*) why was the Union Jack paraded in Chittoor through the streets by the Police Reserve constables on the morning of the 30th August and whether the same was hoisted in the Town Police Station, and, if so, why?

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) The Government understand that the flag-hoisting ceremony was observed in several districts but have no detailed information of the particular places in which it was observed. In the Chittoor district it was temporarily prohibited in the following places:—

Kuppam, Tirupati, Tirumalai, Chittoor, Puttur, Narayanavaram, Tiruttani, and Kalahasti.

(*c*) The police apparently wished to make a demonstration.

Prohibition of all flag-hoisting ceremonies.

* 439 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether all flag-hoisting ceremonies have been prohibited by the Sub-Magistrates of Tirupati, Puttur and Tiruttani, in their respective jurisdictions, and if so, why;

(*b*) why such orders have been issued in spite of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact; and

(*c*) what steps the Government have taken to cancel them?

31st October 1931]

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the answers to clauses (a) and (b) of question No. 450 and the answer to question No. 437.

(c) None.

Alleged ban by the First-class Magistrate, Gudur, on the Zamindari Ryots' Conference proposed to be held at Venkatagiri.

* 440 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased—

(i) to state whether the Government have taken explanation from the Sub-Collector-Magistrate of Gudur for issuing orders under section 144 against the holding of a Zamindari Ryots' Conference at Venkatagiri; and

(ii) to place the correspondence on the table?

A.—(i) No.

(ii) No.

Alleged issue of an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, against the organizers of the Depressed Classes Conference at Eluvankottai.

* 441 Q.—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to lay on the table of this House the report referred to in answer to question No. 164 asked on 5th August 1931?

A.—A copy [a] of the Sub-Magistrate's order, dated the 14th June 1931, is placed on the table.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"The order passed by the Sub-Magistrate is printed in the Appendix. May I know, Sir, whether Government is aware that this order has caused resentment among the depressed classes in view of the fact that they are law abiding and peaceful citizens?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No."

Labour

Operations of the Labour Department in Tinnevelly district.

* 442 Q.—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) when the operations of the Labour Department were started in Tinnevelly district; and

(b) to how many taluks the operations of the Labour Department were extended and how many of the taluks are left untouched by the department?

A.—(a) In 1929–1930.

(b) The operations of the department have so far extended to four taluks.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IX on pages 339–340 infra.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY — TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

[31st October 1931

Supervision and cost of labour societies.

* 443 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of labour societies formed up to date and how many out of them are still working;

(*b*) the total amount lent to them by Government and how much out of it has been recovered, and how much is overdue and how much has been written off; and

(*c*) the number of inspectors and peons and higher officials employed to form and supervise the working of the labour societies and their annual cost to the Government?

A.—It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to Co-operative Societies for the Depressed Classes.

(*a*) 1,810 such societies were working on 1st April 1930.

(*b*) The statement below gives the advances and recoveries during the last ten years:—

Year.	Advances.	Recoveries.
	RS.	RS.
1920–21	1,04,543	73,728
1921–22	1,40,340	87,886
1922–23	93,005	63,418
1923–24	4,29,465	1,89,732
1924–25	2,07,542	76,748
[a]1925–26	5,53,611	1,30,098
1926–27	5,29,283	60,180
1927–28	51,252	1,21,897
1928–29	49,377	52,589
1929–30	63,068	66,218

The amount of loan overdue on 1st April 1930 was Rs. 3,42,115 and the amount written off up to that date was Rs. 94,695-4-9.

(*c*) 1 Deputy Registrar, 144 Inspectors, 1 clerk, and 14 peons. The annual cost is Rs. 1,62,814.

Action taken by the Government on the Report of the Whitley Commission.

* 444 *Q.*—Mr. C. Basu Dev: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state what action, and when, the Government propose to take on the recommendations contained in the Report of the Whitley Commission as far as they concern the Local Government?

A.—The recommendations of the Commission are under examination.

---

[a] Includes also advances given and recoveries made in regard to loans to individuals also.

31st October 1931]

Police

Distribution of shorthand-writers now stationed at Vellore.

* 445 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the C.I.D. shorthand-writers are stationed at Vellore and sent to different districts at considerable travelling expense; and

(*b*) whether the Government contemplate distributing and stationing the shorthand-writers at different district headquarters?

A.—(*a*) The Shorthand Bureau is attached to the Provincial Training School, Vellore; the staff are deputed for shorthand work in the districts as necessity arises and draw ordinary travelling allowance.

(*b*) It was decided in 1919 that the balance of advantage favoured the concentration of the shorthand staff at Vellore in preference to distributing it over the districts. The Government have re-examined the question and consider that the advantages of concentration of the staff at Vellore definitely outweigh any small saving in travelling allowance that might be effected by distributing the staff among various centres.

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—"May I know whether this question will be considered by the Retrenchment Committee?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am afraid that question must be put to my hon. Colleague, the Finance Member."

Alleged counter-propaganda by Revenue officials of Godavari East, Godavari West and Kistna districts regarding Re-settlement.

* 445-A *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have issued any orders to the District Magistrates of West Godavari, East Godavari and Kistna to instruct village officers and ryots not to join the Ryots' Association;

(*b*) whether the Government are aware of the fact that Revenue Officers in Gudivada and Bezwada taluks are coercing village officers and ryots to resign from the Ryots' Associations;

(*c*) whether the Government are aware of the fact that the Revenue Officers of Ellore taluk are going about in the villages stating that the ryots can afford to pay the taxes;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the Revenue officials with the help of a handful of persons held a meeting in Ellore on the 18th instant to carry on counter propaganda on Re-settlement problem;

[31st October 1931

(*e*) if so, whether it is a fact that the Revenue Divisional Officer presiding at the meeting prohibited some ryots and others to speak;

(*f*) whether the Government are aware of the recent arrest of Mr. D. Narayana Raju, Ex-M.L.C., member of the Economic Enquiry Committee and four others; and

(*g*) whether there are any instructions to Revenue officials to carry on counter propaganda on the Re-settlement propaganda? [a]

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No.

(*c*) No. The Government are however aware that Revenue Officers are endeavouring to correct misrepresentations made as to the effect of the orders of the Government regarding the resettlement.

(*d*) A meeting was held at Ellore on October 18th and presided over by the Revenue Divisional Officer.

(*e*) Not so far as the Government are aware.

(*f*) Yes.

(*g*) Yes. A leaflet on the subject has been sent to the Collectors for distribution in the villages. A copy [a] of the leaflet is attached.

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"The Government say that they do not have any information regarding this question, as to whether the Revenue Divisional Officer presided at the meeting and prevented certain people from speaking. Will the Government call for the information?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I do not think it is necessary to call for information."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know if Government is aware that Mr. D. Narayana Raju who was once our Colleague here was arrested at a public meeting presided over by the Divisional Officer?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"Yes, I understand that he was arrested?"

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know under what section he was arrested."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I must ask for notice of the question."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I know if Government is aware that at a public meeting where everybody was allowed to attend and which was held to consider a public question, some people alone were not allowed to interject by the presiding Revenue Divisional Officer, and that five gentlemen who were members of that meeting were called up to the platform, were declared an unlawful assembly and arrested?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"This matter is *sub judice* at present."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix X on pages 341–342 infra.

31st October 1931]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS

Assignment of Lands

Assignment of S. No. 203 of Melpulam village, Arkonam taluk, in prejudice to public interests.

446 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that one cent of S. No. 203 of Melpulam village in Arkonam taluk was assigned away recently;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that this assignment is prejudicial to the public interests as it blocks up the right of way to the tope to the west of it; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that for over fifteen years endeavours were made to get this plot assigned and that successive officers dismissed the application for assignment?

A.— (*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The Government have no information.

Public Service

Alleged ill-treatment of the Thattans of British Malabar.

447 *Q.*—Pandit GANALA RAMAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any representation from the Thattan community of British Malabar that they are being treated by the caste people therein as untouchables and that their community may be included in the list of depressed classes for purposes of public service; and

(*b*) what orders the Government have passed on it?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No such representation has been received by the Government.

General

Alleged seizure of Congress flags by the Police in the Chittoor district.

448 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the flags of the Congress people at Kuppam or elsewhere in the Chittoor district were seized by the Police and if so, when and under whose orders; and

(*b*) whether any of the Congress people complained before the Kuppam Sub-Magistrate against the Police that they forcibly took away their flags, and if so, with what results?

A.—(*a*) Flags were seized in Kuppam on the 23rd August and the 15th September 1931 by the Sub-Inspector of Police. No special orders to seize flags were issued by any higher authority.

[31st October 1931

(*b*) A complaint was preferred in the Sub-Magistrate's Court, charging the Sub-Inspector of Police with theft of a flag under section 379, Indian Penal Code. The complaint was dismissed under section 203, Criminal Procedure Code.

Order under section 144, *Criminal Procedure Code, issued by the Sub-Magistrate, Chittoor, on* 11*th July* 1931.

449 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, issued by the Sub-Magistrate of Chittoor on 11th July 1931 against Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar and others was obtained by the District Superintendent of Police, from the Sub-Magistrate, without the knowledge of and contrary to the instructions of the District Magistrate; and

(*b*) whether the District Magistrate had promised the President and Secretary, District Congress Committee, Chittoor, to set aside the order on his return to Chittoor on the 29th July 1931 from camp and whether he did so, and if not, why not?

A.—(*a*) The order which was dated the 12th July 1931 was passed by the Sub-Magistrate of Chittoor on an application made by the Circle Inspector of Police. The District Magistrate had no knowledge of it until after the order was passed. He had not issued any instructions in the matter.

(*b*) The District Magistrate made no such promise.

Order under section 144, *Criminal Procedure Code, prohibiting the flag salutation ceremony fixed for the* 30*th August* 1931.

450 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was served by the Sub-Magistrates of Chittoor, Kuppam, Tiruttani and Puttur on August 30th or thereabout that the Congress flag salutation should not take place on the 30th of August;

(*b*) what were the facts which led to the passing of the above orders;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the District Magistrate sent round a circular to all Subordinate Magistrates that the Gandhi-Irwin Pact has been cancelled;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the District Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate of Chittoor directed all the subordinate officers of the Police of the district to watch all the Congress volunteers and members as persons constituting a grave menace to the peace of the district;

(*e*) whether the District Superintendent of Police ordered all the police to be ready for lathi charges and undergo training for the same;

31st October 1931]

(*f*) on what facts the District Superintendent of Police and the District Magistrate made such regulations and arrangements;

(*g*) whether the Government of Madras issued orders to the Chittoor authorities to take such action and if so, for what reason;

(*h*) whether the Government issued any instructions to the district authorities for the observance of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact; and

(*i*) whether the Government issued any instructions to the local authorities to prevent the flag hoisting ceremony on the 30th August and if so, the reasons therefor ?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to the answer to question No. 437.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No.

(*e*) No.

(*f*) Does not arise.

(*g*) No.

(*h*) Immediately after the announcement of the settlement with the Congress the Government issued certain instructions with a view to implementing the settlement.

(*i*) No.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* DISPENSING WITH THE SERVICES OF TEMPORARY STAFF IN THE CENTRAL SURVEY OFFICE.

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" Mr. President, Sir, under Standing Order 19 of the Madras Legislative Council, I beg leave of this House to make a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely— 12 noon.

> '*the recent order of the Board of Revenue asking the Director of the Central Survey Office, Madras, to dispense with the services of all the temporary staff in that department, who number over five hundreds.*' "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Is the Government prepared to make any statement ? "

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—" I cannot give much information, Sir. I understand a notice has been issued to the temporary staff in the Survey department in anticipation of the fact that there will have to be retrenchment but which members of the temporary staff will be actually sent away, has, I understand, not yet been definitely settled. "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I think that as the matter relates only to temporary establishment and as it is said to be under the consideration of the Retrenchment Committee, I cannot hold the motion to be in order."

NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

IV.—BILLS.

(1) THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL.

* Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Bill No. 17 of 1931) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Members whose names I will give presently.

" Sir, the Bill has been published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* on the 18th August 1931. Before I make a reference to the general provisions of the Bill, I wish to refer briefly to the history of the Devasthanam. Sir, the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanam is one of the richest, or rather the richest, Devasthanam in Southern India. Pilgrims go to that temple from far and wide, in fact from all parts of India. The Devasthanam consists of the main temple at Tirumalai and many subordinate temples at Tirumalai, Tirupati and Tiruchanur. All the temples are situated in the district of Chittoor from which the hon. the Chief Minister hails; and it is particularly fortunate for us that he should be in charge of this portfolio of endowments. I have no doubt that he, as a true and sincere follower of the late revered Raja of Panagal, would be very much interested in placing this piece of legislation on the statute book.

" Sir, let me briefly refer to the management of this Devasthanam. In olden days, the Devasthanam seems to have been managed by Hindu Kings, and after their fall, the control and management of the Devasthanam seem to have gone into the hands of the Nabob of Carnatic who through his Revenue officials was managing it. Then the East India Company came in, and through their Revenue department or the Board of Revenue, under Regulation 7 of 1817, had been managing the Devasthanam. There had been no complaint about the management of the Devasthanam when it was under them. But in the year 1843, I do not know for what reasons, probably under instructions from Home, the East India Company thought it proper that they should divest themselves of this duty. They had been trying hard to find suitable persons to manage this Devasthanam, but they were not able to get hold of proper persons, and unfortunately for the Devasthanam, in the year 1843, on the recommendation of the then Collector of North Arcot, the East India Company appointed one Sevadas of a small mutt called Hathiramjee Mutt to be the sole Vicharanakartha of the Devasthanam. The bad days of the Devasthanam began from that date. From the year 1843, the management of the Devasthanam was anything but satisfactory, and the whole state of affairs has been a complete scandal. Let me give a few facts about the mismanagement of the administration under the Vicharanakartha who came from the Hathiramjee Mutt. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons some of the defects of the administration and the necessity for this legislation have been set forth. A large number of pilgrims make rich offerings to the Deity, but the authorities of the mutt, under the guidance of the Vicharanakartha, divert the offerings from the Deity to the Vicharanakartha or the manager or

31st October 1931] [Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar]

some authority of the mutt. There are large estates which are managed by the Devasthanam. In fact about seven or eight taluks, or nearly half the district, are owned by the Devasthanam, but the management is bad. A lot of money is expended on litigation and sometimes decrees are got, though belated, and even such decrees are not executed in time and are allowed to be time-barred. The details of such mismanagement have been given in the appendix with reference to an interpellation by the hon. Mr. Basu Dev in questions and answers placed on the table of the House yesterday. I do not wish to go into details now but at a later stage I will refer to some of the important defects that have been pointed out. Articles are supplied to the Devasthanam on a large scale, such articles as ghee, camphor, musk, etc. There is no proper supervision over the supply of these articles and even inferior articles are supplied. One or two instances are noted in this statement how far musk pieces of stone and cloth have been supplied which the authorities did not note or did not think fit to note. For such a big Devasthanam there is no proper accommodation for pilgrims at Tirumalai, and no sanitary arrangements worth the name.

"Then with regard to the staff, there is a large staff employed by the Devasthanam, and they have to be working at the whim and caprice of the Vicharanakartha; there is no fixity of tenure and their service is precarious. According to the whims and fancies of the Vicharanakartha, the servants are employed and dismissed. With regard to the gross mismanagement and misappropriation I will refer to the judgment of the District Judge of Chittoor at page 57. The then District Judge of Chittoor, Mr. Manavedan Rajah, summarizes the allegations in regard to this matter—in O.S. No. 31 of 1898—as follows:—

'It will thus be seen that from 1843 (that is, the fateful day on which the control of the Devasthanam passed from the East India Company into the hands of the Hathiramjee Mutt) down to the present time, November 1901, successive Mahants have been mismanaging and misappropriating temple funds which there are no adequate and proper means to recover. The existing system is thus proved to be inadequate. A change is therefore necessary. Thus the first Mahant appears from the accounts to have misappropriated Rs. 92,000 and odd. The second Mahant was found to have defrauded the temple to the extent of Rs. 2,28,000 and odd. The third Mahant was convicted of misappropriating Rs. 2,27,000 and odd. The fourth Mahant was sued for the recovery of Rs. 1,30,000. The defendant (i.e., the present Mahant) is charged with misappropriation of Rs. 6,27,000.

'Then with regard to the charges under litigation.

'Under this head the second Mahant spent Rs. 52,000, the third Mahant Rs. 93,000, the fourth Mahant Rs. 14,000, and the defendant Rs. 30,000 up to the date of suit.'

"In the District Court a scheme was framed. Then it was taken up before the High Court and the High Court Judges have made this remark about the management:—

'. . . the history of what took place subsequent to Seva Doss' death is, to put it shortly, a record of waste and embezzlement'. 'The Mahants have shown themselves to be utterly incompetent to discharge the duties of the office properly and that the surplus income has been misappropriated by them, partly for their own personal use and partly for the aggrandisement of the Mutt.'

[Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar] [31st October 1931

" But the Mahant has large resources. He did not leave matters there, but took up the question to the Privy Council and the Privy Council framed an ex parte scheme which is now in force. But, Sir, as it has been pointed out in this statement, the scheme though on paper it may appear to provide for the exercise of proper control, in practice no such control was exercised as was thought to be necessary. It may be asked, Sir, that after the passing of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act II of 1927, the Hindu Religious Endowments Board could have sufficient control over this Devasthanam. But the powers of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board are after all subject to the Scheme, and therefore their powers are limited; and even when they began to exercise their limited powers, the Mahant with his large resources puts up all sorts of objections in the District Court and completely nullifies the efforts of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board to exercise proper control. The properties of the temple, both movables and immovables, are worth nearly two crores of rupees and the income per annum for the Devasthanam is nearly 15 lakhs. Such a big Devasthanam with such a large income is now left under the management of a body which has been repeatedly commented upon and criticized, and the remarks of the District Judge will clearly show that the management is very bad and discloses a scandalous state of affairs.

12-15 p.m. " Therefore, Sir, it would be clear that there is great necessity for having effective control over these Devasthanams. Any attempt tc amend the existing Scheme would be infructuous and litigation would be protracted and ultimately it would not serve the purpose which we all so much desire. The only course therefore is to take effective and proper control over the Devasthanams by means of this legislation.

" I will now briefly refer to the general provisions of the Bill. Under the Bill the control is sought to be vested in the Hindu Religious Endowments Board which would exercise such control by appointing a full-time Commissioner who would be at the head of all secular affairs of the Devasthanams. The appointment of the Commissioner will be made by the Government on the recommendation of the Endowments Board which has got vast experience in the management of temples.

" The Bill does not seek to interfere with the religious rites and affairs of the Devasthanams. The Vicharanakartha will continue to be the person, who happens to be the head of the Hathiramjee Mutt, and will have charge of the religious affairs of the Devasthanams.

" Then, there is provision made for an Advisory Committee to advise the Commissioner and the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. Provision has also been made for proper audit of the budget. As it is, under the Scheme, it is only required to file a budget in the District Court and there is no provision for getting any change made in it. The Mahant simply files the budget in the District Court. No person has any right to interrogate him on it or interfere with it. Provision also exists in the Bill for proper audit of the accounts.

31st October 1931] [Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar]

According to the Bill a proper budget has to be prepared and sent in time through the Commissioner to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board and this body has power to revise and do such other things necessary in the interests of the Devasthanams.

"No doubt, Sir, there would be some difference of opinion regarding the provision in the Bill relating to the manner of the constitution of the Advisory Committee and the number which it should consist of. These differences could be easily settled in the Select Committee. At this stage it is only necessary for us to go into the main provisions of the Bill. I hope every hon. Member of the House will agree with me that this piece of legislation has been long overdue and that every effort should be made to place these Devasthanams of Tirumalai, Tirupati, etc., on a proper footing providing for effective control over their affairs.

"I therefore move to refer the Bill to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami.
Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
Mr. R. M. Palat.
,, M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanya Chetti.
Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
The Advocate-General.
Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
,, C. Basu Dev.
,, K. Koti Reddi.
,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
,, Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
Dr. P. Subbarayan.

"Sir, with your permission, may I crave leave of the House to suspend Standing Order 39 (2) to enable me to add the following names also to the Select Committee:—

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
Mr. A. B. Shetty.
,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur.
Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
Mr. Daniel Thomas.
,, Yakub Hasan."

Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar:—"Mr. President, in rising to second the motion of my hon. Friend. . ."

Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar:—"Sir, I rise to a point of order and seek your ruling upon this point. The motion has been moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. The debate

[Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar] [31st October 1931

on the motion has therefore to be conducted on the merits and demerits of the various points referred to in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is known to several hon. Members of this House that the Endowments Board and another petitioner Mr. T. K. Alasingaravarada Thathachariar of Tirupati have filed a petition before the District Court of Chittoor for framing adequate rules under the scheme of the Privy Council. It is C.M.P. No. 219 of 1930 under O.S. No. 31 of 1898. It is open to anybody to look into the allegations made in that petition. They are identical with the grounds set forth in the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to this Bill. Only in the one it is in a condensed form and in the other in an extended form. For the information of my hon. Friends I will read out the parellel references. I hold in my hand a copy of the petition now pending in the District Court.

'In the matter of the Privy Council scheme relating to Tirumalai, Tirupati, etc., Devasthanams.

Between

The Commissioners of the Endowments Board, etc.

and

The Vicharanakartha of Tirumalai, etc., Devasthanams.

Petition filed on behalf of the petitioners under clauses 2 and 10 of the order, in the Privy Council Scheme showeth:—

1. That the first petitioner is the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Board, the 2nd petitioner its President and the 3rd petitioner is the Prathama Acharya Purusha holding important Mirasi offices in the Tirumalai, Tirupati, etc., Devasthanams. The Tirumalai, Tirupati, etc., Devasthanams are the richest temple in Southern India. Every Commissioner of the Board is an ardent worshipper of the said temples and the Board is charged with the general superintendence and management of the said temples.' "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" Is the hon. Member presenting a petition to the Council ?"

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—" Sir, we have not been supplied with copies of those papers."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I do not think it is quite in order for the hon. Member from Chittoor to present a petition in this haphazard fashion. I should like to hear him if he has anything to say in favour of his point of order apart from the petition that he has got in his hands."

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—" The petition I now read from is the petition filed by the Endowments Board on matters which are directly the subject matter under discussion in this hon. House at this moment. Standing Order 27 (2) says: 'A Member while speaking must not refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending. The matter in respect of which a judicial decision is now pending is contained in the petition (filed in the District Court) which I am reading. The Bill now under discussion covers the same grounds covered by this petition filed by the Endowments Board. The petition requests the Court to frame additional rules to control the action of the Mahant or Vicharanakartha. Here with

31st October 1931] [Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar]

the same object in view we are attempting a legislative enactment. Therefore I was simply referring to the provision or provisions of the Bill and the contents of the petition now pending a judicial decision. The allegations made in the petition are the same as those mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill, viz., inadequate supervision, wastage of funds, mismanagement and so on. The Bill in its Statement of Objects and Reasons says that there is imperative need to provide better accommodation for pilgrims at Tirumalai, etc., and that unwary pilgrims are misled into making their offerings at wrong quarters, etc. The petition also says the same thing. It says that it is necessary to frame additional rules regarding the receipts of all offerings, incomes, etc. The petition also submits that the decrease in income is mainly due to the respondent being in charge of the collections. So, the object of both the petition and the Bill is the same. Again, in another portion the petition contains the following:—

'The Treasurer or the assistant treasurer have no power to check or punch the tickets under the existing rules or have they power to prohibit the admission of pilgrims for special sevas without tickets or the free performance of festivals for the benefit of the individual pilgrims. The income from Arjithams, etc., amounts to nearly two lakhs of rupees a year. Then there is the complaint about the purchase of provisions, etc. It is said therein that the foodstuffs and other provisions are now purchased for the temples for a lakh and a half rupees a year which is nearly twice as much as in the year 1911, and that the best quality or the proper quantity has not been supplied to the temples in consequence. The discretion given in the acceptance of the tenders has been abused in many cases by the respondent (Mahant) and it is learnt that in certain cases the contractors were mere name-lenders for some Byragis or other disciples of the Mutt.' "

Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar (*interrupting*):—" Mr. President, Sir, Standing Order 27 (2) has been pressed into use by my hon. Friend, Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. I should like to raise another point of order. Sir, in the same Standing Order which my hon. Friend relies upon, the following sentence occurs: 'The matter of every speech must be strictly relevant to the matter before the Council.' Sir, an hon. Member while speaking must not refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending. So, when the Mover of the Bill was making his speech, if he referred to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending, it was the business of the hon. Gentleman to have raised the point of order then and drawn your attention to it. I submit, seeing that he did not raise the point at that stage, the question does not arise at this stage."

* The hon. the President:—" Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar will finish his point of order." 12-30 p.m.

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I submit, Sir, that the point of order that has been raised may be confined to a short statement instead of illustrating that point of order by reading in extenso all the statements made in the petition filed in the District Court of Chittoor and also the statements made in the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to this Bill ? It seems to me to be sufficient if he illustrates his point of order by quoting one single instance."

Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar:—"I wanted to compare the provisions of the present Bill with the existing state of affairs which formed the subject-matter of enquiry in the District Court of Chittoor. I waited till the hon. Member who moved for the introduction of this Bill finished his speech so that I might place all the facts which form the subject-matter of enquiry in the District Court of Chittoor and also the provisions of the present Bill before the whole House just to show how both these things are identical."

Mr. C. Basu Dev:—"May I ask if the hon. Member is reading from a speech ?"

* The hon. the President:—"I have to say that we cannot strictly apply that Standing Order to the question now raised. I do not think there is any point of order."

* Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar:—"Sir, it is very gratifying to note that this is not a party measure. On the other hand it is a non-party measure inasmuch as Members of almost all the various sections of this House have given notice of the Bill. However, it is very essential that there should be unanimity of opinion in this House on this measure. Though it is not entirely a piece of social legislation, all the affairs concerning this temple are of interest to the public. The millions of people who come to worship do not know that there is such a thing as Hathiramji Mutt different from the temple. These Mahants and Bairagis do not owe any allegiance to the temple, nor have they endowed any property of their own, to this temple. It may be that the temple has become richer during the term of office of the Mahants as trustees of the temple. There is no private right of the Mahant involved in this question, which we have to take into consideration on this occasion. As regards the management of the affairs of the temple, for the past 80 years by the Mahants, it is very interesting to note what the hon. Judges of the High Court have said on this point. It has been very well summarised by the Hon'ble Judge of the High Court and subsequently approved by Their Lordships of the Privy Council as a 'record of waste and embezzlement.' There have been a number of complaints against the administration by pilgrims and others. In 1901, Mr. K. C. Manavedan Rajah, the learned District Judge of Chittoor, gave out in his judgment in O.S. No. 31 of 1898, what his opinion was with reference to this Mutt and by hon. Friend from North Arcot has just now read out extracts from it. If hon. Members go through carefully the able memorandum submitted by the President of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, placed on the table of the House favouring this Bill, they will come to the conclusion that this Bill is very necessary especially in these days of social reform and social legislation.

"Sir, in the midst of their extravagences, the Mahants have not cared for the pilgrims. It is not a place where hundreds of pilgrims worship, but it is a place where thousands of people go every day. It is the comfort of pilgrims that we have to take into consideration above all things. These pilgrims have not good residences to stay

31st October 1931] [Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar]

there and they are not admitted easily into the temples unless they have the favour of the Bairagis. With regard to the provisions and articles purchased for the temple it is said that the whole affair is hopelessly mismanaged, that tenders are indiscriminately accepted, that the rules governing these are not adhered to. This Devasthanam has very large estates comprising two or three taluks. For the management of such large estates an able administrator should be at the head of affairs. I learn that the ryots are not contented. Recently there was a deadlock between the ryots and the temple authorities. There are arrears of land revenue to the extent of six or seven lakhs of rupees. In the management of a big concern like this where there are large temples and estates, necessitating the services of a large number of employees, these employees should have security of tenure, definite terms of service, and also an assurance that those terms will be adhered to. Various complaints have been made that some employees have been dismissed, others suspended and in the case of a few others increments stopped without any principle. A number of educational institutions are under the control of the present Mahant. No doubt the present Mahant is an educated man. But there is no guarantee that all his successors should be educated persons as the Mahant has the right to nominate anybody whom he chooses as his successor. As a matter of fact he may nominate even a minor. To entrust such a big establishment, these large estates and schools in the hands of the Mahant is not at all a businesslike proposition. The temple and the Math have been so wound up together that many cannot distinguish them as two separate institutions. It is alleged that the Math has been enriched at the cost of the temple, that the Bairagis in the Math make money from the pilgrims. The South Indians and the North Indians come all the way to worship Lord Venkateswara only and they do not owe any allegiance to the Math.

" In the past attempts have been made for the better management of this institution. There is the scheme as a result of Privy Council decision. I need not take the House through the protracted proceedings in the District Court, the High Court and the Privy Council, in this connexion. According to the present scheme only a copy of the budget has to be filed by the Mahant in the District Court and nobody can scan it. So far as this temple is concerned, although there is the Hindu Religious Endowments Act, we cannot effectively apply that Act to this temple inasmuch as we have to apply it subject to the scheme. So the Hindu Religious Endowments Board are helpless in this matter. They are not able to exercise control over it. They are not even able to get information as to the affairs of the temple. To a letter from the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, dated September 1925, to the Mahant, the latter replied, that having regard to the decision of the Privy Council, it is enough if he files a copy of the budget in the District Court and that he is not bound to reply the Board's letter. This only shows that that the present Act is ineffective and this is patent from the President of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board's memorandum before us. Some of the worshippers have

launched suits against the Mahant, but all in vain. It is too idle to expect private persons to set right things against a person like the Mahant with vast resources at his disposal. One of the allegations made against him is that he spends plenty of money in litigation, and therefore nobody can afford to continue a protracted litigation against him. As a matter of fact in the previous litigation the other side was not represented in the Privy Council during the last stages of the case. It is said that under the present scheme the District Judge can look into the affairs of the temple. But I believe District Judges are generally averse to interfere in such matters. You cannot expect the District Judges to devote that amount of time and energy which are necessary. As a matter of fact although the petition referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar was filed in 1930, I do not think that it has reached any stage for decision. It only shows the delay in litigation and that Courts cannot interfere usefully in these matters. Sir, the enactment of a separate law was found necessary by Mr. E. F. Elliot so long ago as 1869.

"Mr. E. F. Elliot, in his judgment in O.S. No. 14 of 1867 (delivered in 1869) expressed his opinion that the system of management that had been prevailing since 1843 was itself wrong and added: 'this I consider must continue to be the case until a radical reform is effected by some other Act of Legislature either by reverting to the system of Government management, which while it lasted proved apparently most successful and efficient as well as economical or of putting the management of these pagodas on some better footing than under the control and superintendence of ascetics, who are essentially men not versed in business or the ways of the world, for it cannot be expected that one ascetic can be a better secular manager than another or that better results are to be derived by the dismissal of the present incumbent.' The need then felt for a separate Act of Legislature is more imperative now, than ever before.

"With regard to the provisions of the Bill, I have only to say that they are moderate and well balanced. There may be some defects here and there, but they can be rectified in the Select Committee. There are three noteworthy features in the Bill, viz., (1) the Commissioner, (2) the Vicharanakartha and (3) the Advisory Committee. The Commissioner is asked to look after the secular management of these institutions. I hope hon. Members will realize the necessity for a responsible Chief Executive Officer,—no matter what you call him,—whether Commissioner or Peshkar or head clerk—to manage an estate which yields an annual income of 16 lakhs of rupees, if any good is to be derived from the management of such an estate.

"Every day hundreds of pilgrims visit the place and elaborate arrangements have to be made for the proper collection and management of the whole of their offerings which they give piece-meal. I am prepared to assume that the present Mahant is quite a competent man in spite of his recent illness when he was not supposed to be of sound mind. But where is the guarantee that future Mahants will be able to

31st October 1931] [Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar]

satisfy the qualifications necessary for the management of this institution? It is true that he is deprived, by this Bill, of the uncontrolled powers which he is now enjoying. The Commissioner is only a nominee of the Government and is given powers only to manage his own office, and collect the revenue that is derived from the estate. He is not given powers to interfere with the temporal affairs of the temple, nor with the persons employed by the Mahant to conduct religious ceremonies of the temple. The serious objection to the Bill by the Mahant is the appointment of the Commissioner, if the Bill is passed into law. I should consider that if this Bill is passed without making provision for the appointment of a chief executive officer, viz., the Commissioner, it will be nothing. It will be worse than the present state of affairs. With regard to the Vicharanakartha and his position as provided in the Bill, I can only say that the Bill does not try to impair his dignity. It will enable him to devote more time to the temple.

"As a matter of fact, this Mahant has not been able to devote much time to the temple on account of his ill health. He cannot manage both the landed estates and the temple and consequently the management is inefficient. It has been said by the other side that if this Bill was passed, it would reduce the Mahant to the position of a *monigar*. The Mahant will even then be the sole authority in the matter of the conduct of festivals, ceremonies and worship. A religious person like him should consider it a proud privilege to carry out these religious functions. If he considers it *infra dig* to occupy that position of religious head of the temple and carry out these religious functions, I consider it better, that he goes out completely. 12-45 p.m.

"With regard to the appointment of the Commissioner, I urge that his appointment should solely rest with Government and that the Mahant should have nothing to do with it. Otherwise, the Commissioner will be liable to the influence of the Mahant.

"With regard to the appointment of an Advisory Committee, I think it will tend to have a steadying influence, on the administration of the Devasthanam. Advisory committees are appointed for the management of bigger concerns such as the railways. Advisory committees have their place in the scheme of things and I do not see any reason why there should be any objection to constituting an Advisory Committee for the management of such a public institution like these devasthanams in question. I am sure such a Committee will work in the best interests of the people, the temple and the Mahant also. Though their resolutions are not binding on the Commissioner, they will have a great effect on his work and on the attitude of the Endowments Board and Government.

"With regard to the composition of the Advisory Committee, I am not particular that it should contain only representatives of the Legislative Council. Local bodies, as the District Board of Chittoor, the Municipal Council of Chittoor and other important bodies interested in the devasthanam may be asked to send representatives to the Committee. The number of members may be settled in the Select Committee.

[Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar] [31st October 1931

"With regard to the justification for bringing this Bill, I would like to say a few words. As this temple was under the management of Government formerly, I think we are perfectly justified in bringing any measure for the better management of the devasthanam at any stage when we think that the present incumbent in office is not able to discharge his duties properly. In these days of democracy it is agreed on all hands that religious institutions should be controlled by Government. There was a great opposition to the Hindu Religious Endowment Bill when it was introduced and passed into law in 1925 and when the Act was amended in 1927. The Bills were passed with great difficulty. Between then and now public opinion generally has veered round in favour of the principle of control of religious institutions. If there is to be a referendum now on the question of Government control of religious institutions, I am pretty sure that the vote will be in favour of it. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: 'Question.') The late Raja of Panagal was very much interested in the control of religious institutions. If he were living now, he would be one of the happiest persons to see a Bill of this kind becoming law. The principle of control of religious institutions was at first his thought. Now, it is gratifying to note that it is no more a party question and that it is the thought of all. With these words, I beg to second the motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It has been moved and seconded that the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill (Bill No. 17 of 1931) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Members a list of whom has been circulated already. For the convenience of the House I would suggest that all those hon. Members who have given notice of similar Bills might speak on this particular Bill and formally move their Bills later on in the order in which they are entered on the Agenda paper."

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I move—

'*that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.*'

"My object in moving this motion is this. Certain facts relating to this Devasthanam after 1898 are now the subject of enquiry in the District Court of Chittoor. If we circulate the Bill for eliciting opinion on it, by the time we receive the opinions of the public, we will also have the benefit of the judgment of the Chittoor Court. All the decisions of Courts of Law on this subject were given before 1898. The Courts of Law have not pronounced any opinion on matters which have occurred since 1898. The matters referred to in this Bill and in the Civil Miscellaneous Petition will be decided by the Chittoor District Court shortly and we will have the benefit of their opinion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Hon. Members need not refer to any matter that is pending before the Court, especially in view of the Standing Order to which I have referred."

Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—"All I wanted to say was that it would be better if we had the opinion of the Court on several matters in addition to eliciting public opinion."

31st October 1931]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"I second the motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The amendment as well as the original motion are now for discussion."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The devasthanam is of all-India importance. Pilgrims go there not only from South India but also from North India. Years back there was a suit filed by the Dharmarakshana Sabha of Madras for the purpose of framing a scheme for the management of the devasthanam. The Sabha also filed suits for the purpose of framing schemes for other devasthanams also. Some of the schemes are working well, while others like the Tirupati Scheme require alterations. In the view of the courts and also, I think, in the view of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, the Tirupati Scheme requires alterations. Certain petitions have been filed in the court to have the scheme altered so that the temple may be better managed. The machinery of the court may or may not be adequate for the purpose. But if a Select Committee is appointed now to go into the question, it will take evidence—if it is so authorized—only from persons who are interested in it and who can come before it. But as this is a temple whose importance is not confined to particular localities or particular communities or groups of communities in South India, but which is of all-India importance, I submit that the Bill will suffer nothing but on the other hand, gain very much by time being allowed to the public for eliciting their opinion thereon. For these reasons, I heartily support the motion of Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar."

* Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I support the Bill and at the same time oppose the amendment of Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar said that this devasthanam is of all-India importance. That is the very reason why I submit that a Bill of this kind is absolutely necessary. When the matter goes before the Select Committee, they will be at liberty to go into all the details and call for any records which they may think necessary for the purpose. It is not necessary for us here to say that the committee should take this kind of evidence or that kind of evidence. As hon. Members are aware, I obtained leave of this House at its last meeting for the introduction of the Tirumalai-Tirupathi Devasthanams Bill. Before I move that Bill I should like to say a few words on the present Bill itself. Both the Mover and the Seconder of this Bill have told the House the necessity for a measure of this kind at the present moment. They have made out such a clear case that I do not want to cover the same ground again.

"I request hon. Members to realize that in the case of this devasthanam, it is imperatively necessary to make satisfactory arrangements for its administration, even presuming that all the allegations about its present management are untrue. The devasthanam derives an annual income of more than ten lakhs. Large offerings are made by pilgrims coming from all over the country and extensive landed estates are owned by the devasthanams. The Hindu Religious Endowments Board

[Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar] [31st October 1931

has, in its memorandum, expressed its helplessness in improving the affairs of the devasthanam under the present management. Even the amendment of the rules, for which a petition has been filed in the District Court to which my hon. Friend Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar referred, would be merely tinkering with the existing system, while what is required is a thorough reorganization of the existing arrangement.

"I will now briefly touch upon the main scheme of the Bill and explain its salient features. In the first place, the Bill provides for the bifurcation of the management of the secular and religious affairs of the devasthanam, so that a whole-time officer of administrative experience may be in charge of its secular affairs, while the Mahant may continue to supervise the proper performance of the religious functions, ceremonies and festivals in the main shrine and its allied temples. Such a bifurcation has been considered necessary by courts even in the case of some smaller temples. The chief executive officer proposed in the Bill, to be called a Commissioner of the devasthanam, will be appointed by Government in consultation with the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, on a salary not exceeding Rs. 1,000 per mensem. For an institution of such an importance as Tirupati it should not require much argument on my part to show that the officer at the helm of secular affairs should be of some status to command the esteem of the public and the subordinates in the service of the devasthanam. The Hindu Religious Endowments Board is empowered by the Bill to pass the budget prepared by the Commissioner with due regard to the views of the Vicharanakartha and the Advisory Committee proposed to be constituted under the Bill. The Board will also frame by-laws relating to sanction for estimates, creation of posts, appointments and punishments of the officers and servants of the devasthanam, contracts for supply of articles and other similar matters which are now left unregulated. The servants who have to attend to the religious ceremonies and functions will be entirely under the control of the Vicharanakartha, while the rest will be under the control of the Commissioner. It is also provided in the Bill that the Board should settle doubts that may arise as to whether a particular function comes under the secular or the religious side of the devasthanam service. The Board is also expected to determine the application of surplus funds in educational and other activities such as provision of sanitary arrangements, etc. In certain matters of importance provision has been made allowing the Vicharanakartha or other aggrieved persons to resort to the District Court for getting the orders of the Board revised, for instance, its orders on the budget and its decisions in regard to the utilization of surplus funds. The provisions of the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act II of 1927 in regard to the right of persons having interest to institute a suit for obtaining reliefs and the appointment of an interim Vicharanakartha under special circumstances are retained in the Bill. The Advisory Committee contemplated in the Bill will be the mouthpiece of the public in having the grievances brought to the notice of the Vicharanakartha and the Commissioner with suggestions for effecting

31st October 1931] [Mr. C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar]

improvements in the administration of the devasthanam. The existing rights of the hereditary officers and servants of the devasthanam are specially safeguarded in the Bill.

"Before I conclude, I would request hon. Members to remember 1 p.m. that, by enacting this measure, we are not taking away the vested rights of any family in which succession to trusteeship was hereditary. There is no use referring to the state of affairs prevailing in 1843 when the State divested itself of the management of religious institutions or to the conditions prevailing in 1907 when the Privy Council framed the scheme now in vogue. After the Reforms, public policy has changed and by the passing of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act of 1925 and the re-enacting measure of 1927, this legislature has provided for Government control over religious endowments through the Transferred side of the Government and the Hindu Religious Endowments Board working under it. Especially in the case of a devasthanam with such vast resources as Tirupati, special treatment is necessary, and in the nature of the case it cannot but be unique. It is no good instituting comparison between ordinary temples for which the ordinary provisions of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act might be enough. I would request hon. Members to treat this measure as an all-party one and to see that the Bill is passed into an Act at an early date."

* Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"Mr. President, Sir, I heartily support the motion brought by my hon. Friend, Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar, and I oppose the amendment of Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. The memoranda submitted by the Hindu Religious Endowments Board as well as by Mr. Ananthasayanam reveal a most scandalous state of affairs; it is not something but almost everything that is rotten in the state of Tirumalai and Tirupati. I invite the attention of hon. Members of this House to both these memoranda and request them to consider the state of affairs revealed by these memoranda. People in many parts of the country and in our coast also, have been under the impression that, after the introduction of the Scheme framed by the Privy Council, things have been going on well in Tirumalai and Tirupati. They will be sadly disappointed if they were to know that the misappropriation and waste that was characteristic of the regime in Tirumalai and Tirupati in the days before the scheme, is still continuing in some form or other as is evidenced from the remarks of judicial officers in several cases. I understand that in 1912 there was a suit by Sir S. Subrahmanya Ayyar for removal of the present Mahant. The Mahant is the boss of the whole show; his powers are arbitrary and uncontrolled. In the matter of the budget, his power over expenditure is uncontrolled, he can spend the vast income of the temple to the last pie and also draw upon reserves. Nobody has the power to scan the budget or to go into its merits; he can transfer the allotment from one head to another; he can increase expenditure and come forward with a supplementary budget. As regards the main items of expenditure, previous speakers have already drawn attention to what is happening there. Provisions worth more than one lakh of rupees are required every year; we are told that they are purchased through benami contractors or the tenders

[Mr. A. B. Shetty] [31st October 1931

of the Mahant's proteges are accepted in preference to other tenders. As regards public works, we are told that, in the last 15 years, several lakhs have been spent on buildings. There is no expert scrutiny of the estimates prepared for these buildings nor is there any strict supervision over the construction of buildings. A petition in the court asking that works costing over Rs. 5,000 should have plans and estimates approved by an officer of a sufficiently high rank and they should be check-measured by him after completion is said to have been opposed by the Mahant. The devasthanam has a large establishment costing nearly Rs. 3 lakhs; the scale of pay is not fixed; new posts are said to be created and old posts abolished at the sweet will and pleasure of the Mahant; there are no service regulations nor any provision for appeals against punishment. Exorbitant amounts are spent on litigation. As the High Court remarked some time ago, what is saved from misappropriation is spent away in litigation. Audit is a farce; there is no concurrent audit; audit takes place long after the bills are passed and the auditor is not asked to find whether the expenditure is in accordance with budget provisions. The estate management is said to be hopeless; the investments over lands amount to several lakhs but the rate of interest that these investments fetch is said to be as low as 1 per cent and more than Rs. 7 or 8 lakhs of rent are said to be in arrears. There are no decent buildings or rest-houses for pilgrims at Tirumalai; the richer class of pilgrims have to go to the Math if they want comfortable lodgings and so many people are made to pay their offerings to the Math instead of to the temple on account of misrepresentations to the effect that whatever is paid to the deity at the temple goes to the temple officers and to the coffers of the Government. In the matter of surplus, the rules require that it should be invested every year; but this does not seem to be always done. Nor is the surplus utilized for proper purposes. Now the surplus is all gone. The Math is said to have been enriched at the expense of the temple; its income of Rs. 10,000 has now swelled to more than one lakh. There have been several petitions to modify the rules and all these petitions have been dismissed. There was a petition to modify the Scheme, filed by Mr. T. R. Ramachandra Ayyar, a leading advocate of this place so far back as 1912 for setting right the administration, and that petition was dismissed All the attempts that have been made through the courts to set matters right in the matter of administration, have failed. Any further attempt for the modification of the Scheme will only result in protracted and costly litigation. The Mahant has got vast resources at his back and no individual worshipper is in a position to contend against him in the courts and spend money. The very passing of the Religious Endowments Act was resisted by the Mahant and he is said to have spent more than Rs. 30,000 for this purpose. The Endowments Board finds itself practically helpless in effecting any improvements in the administration of Tirupati. If the Board asks for any information, for copies of the budget or of audit reports, the Mahant refuses to give them; he says that the Religious Endowments Board has no jurisdiction over this temple and it has no right to call for the budget,

31st October 1931] [Mr. A. B. Shetty]

The suggestions of the Board for any improvements are not accepted. The powers of the Board are subject to the Scheme; so, unless the Scheme is modified and definite powers of control are vested in the Board, the Board cannot do anything. The Board itself has been thinking of enacting a special legislation for the purpose of setting matters right in this devasthanam and it welcomes the present Bill. I am glad that this Bill is being sponsored by Members representing several sections of the House.

" The objects of this Bill have been explained by hon. Members who have already spoken and I do not think it is necessary to go over the same ground. We have to take note of the fact that the Mahant has neither founded this temple nor endowed any properties to it; he cannot claim to be the supreme arbiter over the affairs of the temple. The people of this province must have a voice in its management. A temple with such vast income should have honest and efficient management. If the Mahant has only the interests of the temple at heart, he should not seek to put impediments in the way of this Bill. Public opinion now is definitely in favour of legislation for the better administration and control of the religious endowments in this province. It is the duty of the hon. Minister who is responsible for the good administration of our temples to see that this legislation is placed on the statute book as early as possible. This Bill will of course receive due consideration from the Select Committee and be suitably altered before it is passed by this Council."

* Khan Bahadur MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—" Sir, I rise to support the motion for circulation of the Bill, before committing it to the Select Committee. An hon. Friend suggested that I should not interfere in the discussion of this Bill—as I am a Muhammadan and the Bill relates to a Hindu temple. It is true I am a Muslim and the devasthanam is supposed to belong to a community known as the Hindu. But, Sir, I may point out that these religions are not so very different. My own idea is that there is very little difference between the Hindu and Muhammadan religions, if you go to the origin of these religions and even to the method of worship. The Koranic conception of religion is that all who believe in one Supreme Being are Muslims or are of the true religion. The present tendency that is fast developing is that there cannot be but one religion, as there can be only one God, and that religion is God's religion. I also understand that some of the valuable properties belonging to the temple were endowed by Muslims.

" Sir, this temple is a very rich temple with very hoary traditions of its own; it has been in existence for several years. It is a well-known fact that people come to this temple from all parts of India. It is not only the people of this presidency that are interested in this temple but even people from other parts of India and of other religions are interested.

" One of the charges made against the Mahant is that he has been misappropriating the proceeds of the temple; no court, Sir, has, so far,

[Mr. Mahmud Schamnad] [31st October 1931

held that the present Mahant is guilty of breach of trust. Another charge made against him is that he is employing *bairagis* for the management of the temple. Who are these biragis ? Are they all ignorant people ? Simply because they have given up wordly things, are they to be supposed to be fools or to know nothing about the affairs of this world ? What about Mr. Gandhi ? Is he not a sanyasi ? Would you say that he is not capable of managing such temples ? This is such an important matter that it should not be rushed through. I do not say that no reforms are necessary; some reforms may be necessary. But the Privy Council has framed a Scheme under which the temple is being managed now. The District Court of Chittoor is given power to appoint an additional manager; all safeguards have been taken to prevent mismanagement. It is admitted that budgets are being prepared every year; and copies of these budgets are filed in the District Court. When all these precautions are being taken, we should not rush to the conclusion that the affairs of the temple are altogether mismanaged or that the amounts of the temple are altogether misappropriated. I beg of this House to give sufficient time for the people and for the Members here to understand the import of the Bill. The Mahant has been managing the affairs of the temple for several years now. It is admitted that several schools have been started by him; several charitable institutions are being conducted and so many other useful things also are being done. The money and the temple are not going to be swallowed by anybody by the lapse of a few months. Let us give some time and not give the impression to the people that we are rushing through the Bill, because some people are interested in it. If the Bill is referred to the Select Committee now, you know what will happen. In a few days the Committee may submit some report. It may immediately be taken up for consideration and passed as usual, perhaps the hon. the President putting clause after clause to the Council while the Members have very little time to study the different aspects of this legislation.
1-15 pm. The others may not have sufficient time to know anything about it, but the whole thing will be passed. What I say is: there must be sufficient time for the people to study and understand the Bill. The Government also must appoint a committee to take evidence and to examine witnesses and the Government themselves must know where they stand. Therefore, Sir, I support the motion for circulation."

*Rao Bahadur T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai:—"Mr. President, I support the motion that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee and oppose the motion that it be circulated for eliciting public opinion. It is significant that the Mover and the Seconder of the amendment have not traversed the allegations made in support of the motion to refer this to a Select Committee. The main allegation in support of the motion for referring it to a Select Committee is that the administration of the devasthanam has been a record of waste and embezzlement and that there is need, in the interests of the public, for better management. That allegation remains unanswered. Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar referred to the fact that really the subject-matter is under investigation by the Court. This is significant, this only means that

31st October 1931] [Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai]

there is sufficient ground for being investigated by the Court. That shows there is something wrong with the affairs or the administration of the Tirupati devastanam. Therefore, the very ground that was urged by the Mover of the amendment is a point in support of the fact that a Bill of this kind is necessary, and the sooner it is referred to a Select Committee, the better it is for all concerned. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar then urged as a reason in support of the amendment, the fact that this temple is of an all-India character and that therefore sufficient time ought to be given to people in the north to express an opinion on the Bill. But I should be permitted to say that all the properties of the devasthanams are all situated in our presidency. We, in this presidency, have expressed strongly that the affairs of this devasthanam are not conducted properly. So, if the opinion of people outside the presidency is to be expressed at all, it should be based only on public opinion of people in this presidency. It is significant that so far there has not been a single suggestion that the administration is all right. If we here find the administration to be bad, it is up to us to come forward with proposals to set it right and not merely wait for the opinion of people outside who will be guided only by our own opinion.

"Then came Mr. Schamnad who made a number of assertions, but I am sorry they are not at all based on facts. If he had been a pilgrim or even if he had paid a visit to the place, we could have given weight to his assertions. Therefore, to circulate the Bill for eliciting public opinion at this stage, is like delaying the matter which is admitted on all hands to be urgent and necessary. The Bill has not been introduced now for the first time. That there should be a Bill in respect of this devasthanam has been long in the air. If I am not mistaken, even in the last Council there were people who were anxious that a Bill of this kind should be introduced. Why, as a matter of fact, even when the last Hindu Religious Endowments Act was under consideration, efforts were made to bring this endowment under the Act. It was on account of the influence which the Mahant possessed that the attempt failed. Therefore, it is not as though this Bill comes before this Council for the first time. This has been before the public for the last six or seven years ever since 1925. (An hon. Member: 'Has the Mahant lost his influence now ?') Somebody asks me whether the Mahant has lost his influence. I am not able to answer it, but I may say that public opinion is now getting better informed on the matter. It is also significant that in support of this Bill there was in Madras a public meeting presided over by an eminent gentleman interested in the administration of religious endowments. As this Bill has been before the public for a very long time, I think sufficient time has been allowed for public opinion to assert itself—at least since the last Council when the leave for introducing this Bill was granted. After the publication of the Bill in the Gazette, public opinion, in so far as we know it, has expressed itself in favour of the present Bill. At the same time, it does not mean that if this Bill is referred to a Select Committee, public opinion cannot hereafter be expressed. For these considerations, Sir, I oppose the amendment and I support the motion of Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar."

[31st October 1931

* Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo:—"Sir, though the Bill is in form a new Bill, in substance it is only an amendment of the Religious Endowments Act. Already the Endowments Act extends to the temple and the Board has got some control over it; but there are certain difficulties. With a view to remove those difficulties this Bill is introduced, in other words, to do away with the Scheme of the Privy Council which can be set aside or modified only by a suit or other judicial proceedings which may take a long time. That is the reason why this Bill is introduced. Therefore, this is not a new Bill and it is not raising any new or fundamental principle. There is absolutely no reason why there should be circulation. All that is sought to be done is to appoint a commissioner, to be an associate, so to speak, of the trustee, and to apportion the functions between the two. There is also to be a consulting body, I think. The appointment of an associate to the trustee was included in the Scheme framed by the High Court before the matter went up to the Privy Council. Therefore, this idea too is not a new one. The Privy Council removed the provision for the appointment of an associate in its Scheme; and by this legislation, it is practically proposed to revive that provision. It may be said that the same result can be obtained by a suit; but that will be a more costly thing and take a very long time. Therefore, in order to save the Mahant and the people and the Hindu Religious Endowments Board all worry and unnecessary expenditure, this Bill has been introduced. There is no necessity, Sir, for circulating it at this stage."

* Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I also stand to support the original motion and to oppose the amendment. My position is very simple. This is an endowment, a public endowment; and it is not an endowment the creation of which was due to anybody or which was specially contributed for by anybody. It is not a matter in which any person who has been managing the affairs of this endowment for a long time has thereby acquired any special interest either in its management or in any of the benefits arising therefrom. Such being the case, it seems to me that it is the duty of the public to provide for the proper administration of this endowment. That seems to me to be a position which cannot be questioned by any one. It also seems to me that unless the Council intervenes, there is no other satisfactory way of providing for a proper administration of this big endowment. The endowment is probably the biggest in India; it is probably one to which the largest number of people resort from all parts of India. Such being the case, our responsibility is all the greater—since it is situated in our province—to provide for its better administration. What do we find? Almost since the time the endowment was entrusted to the charge of the Mahant who is the head of this Math, we have been seeing some litigation or other has been going on in a most immoral way—if I may put it like that. This institution was handed over to the Mahant about the middle of the last century. Within a few years, litigation starts, petitions are filed in the courts, suits are filed in the courts, and as early as the year 1898, a suit for the proper administration of this endowment was filed in the Chittoor Court which

31st October 1931] [Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar]

went up to the Privy Council. The Privy Council had to frame a scheme ultimately; but in the meanwhile there were other suits by disinterested persons who formed themselves into this Dharmarakshana Sabha in the old days—people like the late Dr. S. Subrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. Ramachandra Ayyar and others. They cannot be said to be people who have no faith in religion or do not care for the proper administration of endowments. Such people thought that there ought to be a proper scheme prepared for the administration of this big endowment. They were not satisfied with the management of this institution by the Mahant. That is a fact. Not only that. Ever since the Privy Council framed its Scheme, almost every year we have been seeing some sort of legal proceeding going on in the several courts of the Presidency. This is not surely a satisfactory state of affairs; and the only way in which this can be avoided is by this Council taking charge of the matter and providing in an Act of its own for the proper administration of the endowment. If we do not do it, what is going to happen? Well, Sir, there will be interminable litigation; litigation means money and it means some interest to be taken in this matter by somebody or other. We have already got a man who is amply endowed with money—money belonging to the endowment—who is interested in keeping things as they are at present; and there are also others who have got no such means for carrying on litigation and whose only interest is the public interest for the proper administration and management of this endowment. I do not think if we, Members of this Council, realize our responsibility, we will allow this matter to be settled again in a court of law, as it can only mean further litigation, further litigation involving large funds belonging to the endowment being wasted, probably interminably going on for several years—waste of money, waste of energy, room for temptation on the one side and probably waste of money belonging to the endowment itself by people who are interested in keeping the present state of affairs. It seems to me, therefore, that our clear duty lies in preventing the people from going to courts of law, and providing a satisfactory method for administering this endowment. In saying this, I think I have given my reply to the motion moved by my Friend Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar for circulation. One ground on which he based his argument was that there is a suit pending in the Chittoor Court and that, if we waited, we would have the opinion of the District Judge. That is really what I want to avoid. I do not want further money to be wasted, nor do I want to allow any more time during which the endowment may be mismanaged in ways which may not appeal to Members here. The sooner we take charge of this matter, the better it is for all concerned. In that view, I oppose the amendment of Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.

"It was also stated by Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar that, unless the Select Committee is authorized by this House, it won't be in a position to know the views of the people outside. I beg, Sir, most respectfully, to correct him. Under Standing Order No. 39 (4), 'A Select Committee may hear expert evidence and the representatives of any special interests affected by the measure before them.' It is therefore always open to them to take the evidence of experts or of persons interested in the Bill.

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar] [31st October 1931

1-30 p.m. "In a matter of this public importance, I do not think it would be difficult to obtain the evidence of any person except probably those persons who are not interested in this matter. Anybody can come and give evidence either in writing or on oral examination. So, I do not think anybody would be affected or prevented from expressing his opinions by our directly referring the Bill to a Select Committee, and leaving it to the Select Committee to go into the Bill in a detailed way.

"I will only refer to one point more, Sir, before I conclude, namely, that it is not absolutely necessary for the Members of this Council to agree to every detail of the proposals that are made for the administration of the endowments. It is quite open to the Select Committee, Sir, to go into the matter fully, hear expert evidence or the evidence of people interested in the matter and frame such a scheme as would satisfy everybody, and at the same time secure the proper administration of the endowment. It is open to them to do all this. As I conceive it, the only thing that the Select Committee cannot go into is the question whether any provision ought to be made anew and whether a Bill for proper administration ought to be passed or not. That they cannot do. But they will have to agree to frame some scheme for the administration of the endowment. That is the principle of the Bill, and I do not think that the Select Committee is entitled to go behind that principle. Leaving it aside, there are various other matters, such as the arrangements to be made and other details of the scheme to be worked out. I beg to submit that it is open to the Select Committee to go into all these questions. If any person has anything to offer in regard to the proposals already made or that are to be made hereafter, it is open to him to make representations before the Select Committee, and it is for the Select Committee to consider all these representations and frame as effective a scheme or proposal as they may find necessary. So, Sir, I do not think that anybody can really have any reason to fear that any matter is going to be specially shut out by this procedure of referring the Bill to a Select Committee. And it is not, as I already said, the case that public opinion or the opinion of persons interested in the Bill will not be available to the Select Committee unless the Bill is circulated for eliciting public opinion. So, Sir, it is for this reason that I am unable to agree with my hon. Friends, Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar and Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar, in their view that the Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion. It is already high time, as I have said, that this matter is settled in some satisfactory way. This matter has been hanging on for a long time; indeed for nearly a century. The management was transferred to the Mahant, and afterwards there was a lot of litigation, and so it is high time that some sort of arrangement should be arrived at, especially in view of the fact that there is a suit pending in the Chittoor Court. I would ask the Council to expedite the matter and come to some conclusion on this question, so that there may be no need for the suit to be proceeded with. It is for these reasons, Sir, that I support very strongly the motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee."

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

V.—ANNOUNCEMENT *RE* THE APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN TO CERTAIN SELECT COMMITTEES ON BILLS.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to announce that I nominate Mr. W. M. Browning as Chairman for the two Select Committees regarding the Madras Gaming (Amendment) Bill and the Madras City Police (Amendment) Bill.

" I nominate Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed as Chairman of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Madras Elementary Education Act, 1920."

IV—BILLS —*cont.*

(1) THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL—*cont.*

Discussion was then resumed on the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill.

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I welcome the introduction of a Bill, the object of which is to ensure efficient management and popular control of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams. In order to justify an object of that sort and the consequent introduction of a Bill to ensure the accomplishment of that object, it does not seem to be necessary for anybody to allege acts of mismanagement and much less to prove them against the present Vicharanakartha. It is enough, Sir, if the public opinion is in favour of preparedness to take the management of a big religious institution like the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams and make such provisions to effectuate that object. Therefore the fact that a suit is pending in a court of law for framing a scheme or for making amendments in the existing Scheme which governs the management of that institution need not act as an impediment for the legislature to go on with this Bill. Any day I am of opinion that control of a popular body of any big institution is much more dependable and much less susceptible to corruptions and autocracy than the management of such institution by a single individual. Probably the individual trustees themselves of temples, hereditary or nominated, might sometimes feel the necessity of assistance of the members of the public who are interested in that institution.

" Though as many as seven or eight hon. Members of this Council have given notice of Bills affecting the proper management of these devasthanams, it is practically one Bill that we have got to deal with. Therefore this House is denied the enlightenment that it would have derived had the Bills been the result of individual thinking of each of the hon. Members who have given notice of this Bill. Presumably all the Bills are drafted by a single author and it is whispered, Sir, that the Bill is the result of considerable thinking in the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. If my presumption is correct, it would have been indeed a very convenient matter for this Council, had that Bill been sponsored by the Government. The Government had been anxious to make improvements in the management of this temple for a considerably long time. When the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was before the legislature, it was thought that the Act aimed particularly at this devasthanam. But owing to some cause or another it was not possible

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [31st October 1931

to exercise effective control over the Tirupati Devasthanams under the existing provisions of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. Therefore the necessity for a separate legislation has been felt by several people and I am not sorry that it has come to-day for the due consideration of the Council and I am also particularly glad that the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee with no previous commitments with regard to the adherence of this Council in respect of particular provisions of the Bill. What is agreed upon by hon. Members representing all parties is that this Council is prepared to draft a measure to ensure proper management and effective popular control over the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanam affairs. Otherwise it would be necessary for us to mention even now our difference of opinion with regard to particular provisions of this Bill. I may frankly say that I am not in favour of several provisions of this Bill which seek to substitute the authority of the Commissioner in the place of the present Vicharanakartha. If the Council or the public are dissatisfied with the management of a single individual as susceptible of being abused, the same reasons apply with equal force, if not greater force, in respect of powers that is sought to be vested in the Commissioner. I know it may be said that the Commissioner's powers are not as unfettered as the Vicharanakartha's are and there is the Hindu Religious Endowments Board to check or control the acts of the Commissioner. Sir, I must here say that the Hindu Religious Endowments Board with all its advertised efficiency has not yet been able to convince either the public or this House of its effective and efficient management. As a matter of fact, its very existence is precarious. The salaries of several of the Commissioners of that Board are still perhaps in arrears and unless the Government advanced loans from time to time one cannot be sure of the continuance of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. Unless the Government are prepared to put the Board on a satisfactory and permanent basis and make it as a limb of the Government, it will be a dangerous thing to entrust any power to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. So, Sir, I am not enamoured of the existence of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board as a supervisory authority over the acts of the Commissioner. (Hear, hear.) Sir, even as we are anxious that the Government of our country should be in the hands of popular control responsible to the people, I would like that experiment is started with regard to an institution of this sort. We have given full autonomy to the local self-governing institutions. We have made the presidents of district boards and municipal boards responsible to the councils and their boards. I would like that instead of making the Advisory Committee as merely nominal only on the analogy of the railway advisory committees which would not at all be complimentary to the advisory committee now proposed, I would make that Committee to be the arbiter of the affairs of the devasthanams concerned because they will be representatives of the people, they will be elected by the people, because they will be persons interested in the proper management of these temples and the estates connected with that temple. So, if you are a believer in democracy and if you think that self-government is a better substitute than even good government, I would insist, Sir, that more powers should be given to the Committee instead

31st October 1931] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

of either to the Vicharanakartha or to the Commissioner. Sir, however, the mere fact that the Commissioner is going to be a substitute to be appointed either by the Board or by the Committee, that mere fact is not going to change the character or the honesty of the persons thus appointed. If a Vicharanakartha with the large influence that he now commands and with the vast wealth that he now possesses is still suspected, to be guarded against what guarantee is there that a person appointed on a thousand rupees pay could be less susceptible to the same temptation which we fear would confront the Vicharanakartha? What guarantee is there that the Vicharanakartha and the Commissioner might not go in shares so far as the spoils from the affairs of this temple are concerned? Unless it be that the Commissioner that is to be appointed is recruited from the permanent and non-retired active servants of the Government, there is no guarantee—I say without meaning any offence to anybody—that retired officers or other persons who may be appointed temporarily for this purpose could be above temptation of being corrupt. I therefore warn those gentlemen, who think that they have done their best by merely substituting the Commissioner in the place of the Vicharanakartha, to be careful lest we should not be confronted even sometime later on with the same or similar set of difficulties as we are now confronted with.

2-45 p.m.

" Sir, I have not so far heard, from the speeches of hon. Members who have spoken before me, what prevented them from giving the Committee more powers than they thought fit to give under the provisions of this Bill. It must be due to the fact that directly they did not take active part in the drafting of the Bill, if they have only wanted to convey their personal opinions on the present bill. But I have no doubt that, so far as the Committee is concerned, it would have been given wider powers and probably supreme control. But at the same time, it must be made plain that under the provisions of this Bill, the Vicharanakartha is reduced to a figure-head. There is no denying that fact. It might probably be the intention of those who are responsible for the introduction of this Bill to reduce him to such a position. I do not want to dispute their intention, nor am I prepared to say whether the Vicharanakartha would or would not be given more powers than what is ensured to him under this Bill. But there seems to be some misconception with regard to his existing duties. I do not think that the Vicharanakartha to-day is anything more than the secular head of that institution. I have not heard that he has got any share in the matter of religious functions except as any ordinary dharmakartha would be. I suppose he is a trustee of the institution in all secular matters; and there is no meaning in saying that so far as secular matters are concerned, we will take away his powers and that we will allow him to exercise the same powers he is now exercising in regard to religious matters. After all, every religious matter becomes secular at one stage or other, even as a secular matter may become a religious matter. If the Vicharanakartha wants a particular festival to be performed, say at 3 or 4 o'clock, on a particular day, is it a secular matter or is it a religious matter? It will be difficult to define where the secular matter

ends and where the religious function begins; and so there is no meaning in saying that so far as secular matters are concerned, the Commissioner would be supreme and in religious matters the Vicharanakartha. If the Commissioner takes into his head to question the Vicharanakartha as interfering in secular matters of which he has got the supreme charge, then there will be no end of trouble, and he may say that the festival shall be conducted at 4 o'clock and not at 3. The Vicharanakartha might say Raghukalam sets in at 4 o'clock and so the festival should begin at 3 o'clock on that day. Then who is to judge that the festival must be celebrated at a particular time? These matters will naturally lead to a clash. It will be a ruinous thing to suggest two independent authorities over one institution. Either it must be frankly admitted that the Vicharanakartha has no power if he is going to be divested of those powers which are now sought to be vested in the Commissioner or the Commissioner must be made subordinate to the Vicharanakartha. That must be made clear. I have no doubt that all these matters will be gone into with due consideration in the Select Committee. I also think that the Select Committee, composed as it is, must not hesitate to receive assistance from people who are interested and who are willing to help us in this matter. Of course, there is no need to say either to the Select Committee or to the Council not to lose sight of the fact, namely, that we are determined to frame a measure to ensure the proper, effective and popular management of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanam affairs.''

* Mr. K. Koti Reddi:—'' I rise to support the motion. In doing so, I hope that the objections that have been raised hereto will be carefully gone into at the time of consideration of this Bill by the Select Committee. I gather from the opinions already expressed that most of the objections are not against conferring the administration and management of the landed estates and the income of the temple into the hands of a Commissioner with a view to ensuring efficiency. My Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti—I do not know whether he has really supported the Bill or is against it—has no doubt put forward some arguments in regard to the powers of the Commissioner, which I hope will receive the attention of the Select Committee. He contended that even as the present Mahant with all his vast wealth and powers is suspected by some people to be not above corruption, so also it is not possible for the future Commissioner that is going to be appointed under this Bill to be above corruption. I admit he might be. But I am one of those who believe that there are persons even in this world, if they are properly selected by the persons responsible for the selection, who will be above corruption. We have known of several instances of public servants, very poorly paid, but who are still above corruption. At the same time, we have officers, very highly paid, concerning whom it cannot be so said. If we think that the world is corrupt and that everybody is corrupt, so nothing need and can be done, and such an argument should not be in our way. I think proper persons for the position can be found. Again there is this difference, that the Mahant is a hereditary trustee and it is not so easy to remove him from that position if he is found undesirable. However, it is for us to come to a conclusion whether

31st October 1931] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

a Commissioner is to be appointed for a definite period of years for a short term or long term to manage the estates. Again, Sir, it is much better that the Mahant is not looked upon merely as a secular head, as my Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti seems to believe. Whatever legally he may be, the popular opinion with regard to the Mahant of Tirumalai-Tirupati temples is that he is a religious head, that he has a good deal to do with the functions and festivals and the performance of various ceremonies connected with the temples, and he is not really looked upon as a mere manager of the estates. As such, it will be much better if the Mahant is disburdened of his secular responsibility of managing the vast estates and income of these temples, especially as we find that the large landed estate requires a full-timed man to efficiently manage them. It will be rather unpleasant for a Mahant who is looked upon not merely as a secular head but also as a religious head, by worshippers from all parts of India, if most of his time is to be devoted to attending to a number of secular questions and troubles, and disputes consequent in managing landed estate. It will therefore be much better that this religious head dissociates himself from certain secular functions, especially those of managing the estates. From that point of view, I think it is absolutely necessary that the Mahant should be disburdened of this responsibility.

" I personally also to a certain extent agree with my hon. Friend that in the Select Committee some of the provisions of the Bill do need some change, and one of those provisions, as my hon. Friend suggested, is that regarding the powers to be conferred on the committee. I hope that the objections raised by my hon. Friend Mr. Parthasarathi Ayyangar, will also be gone into by the Select Committee. Some of us believe that even if the allegations made against the present Mahant with regard to improper use of funds and inefficient management of the estates and his not being above temptation are found untrue by the court, even then a case has been amply made out, as I said, for the appointment of one, who is not connected with the religious ceremonies of the temple to look after the proper management and administration of the vast landed estates. As such, Sir, I believe that the decision which the District Court of Chittoor may be likely to arrive at the various allegations against the present Mahant ought not in any way to deter us from pursuing the course outlined in this Bill. I therefore heartily support this motion."

* Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar :—" Coming from a district in which these temples are situated, I can give some information about the state of affairs there. My Friend, the Mover, has considered only one side of the picture and made his comments upon it. In a question of this kind we have to fall back upon a considerable reserve of reason and commensense, because we have two versions and to find out the equilibrium between the two is probably the work of this House and more so of the Select Committee. One thing I may say, that reading the various judicial pronouncements from 1898 and subsequent petitions 3 p.m.

[Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar] [31st October 1931

that have been presented to the District Court and the High Court, we find that it has been amply demonstrated that whoever might be trustee he must exercise reason and commensense and judgment for the purpose of looking into the affairs of the temple and he must have first-hand knowledge of the working of the scheme. No person should be appointed who is not well versed in the affairs of the temple. Suppose a Commissioner is appointed, he will have to be changed after a certain period, and in the case of such appointment frequent changes will affect the administration for worse. What is happening with regard to this devasthanam during the last thirty years? Till 1843, the Government was in charge and the income of the devasthanam was only one lakh. The amount left over after meeting the expenditure was credited to Government. Not a pie was spent on the devasthanam. What do we find now? The income has risen from one lakh to Rs. 15 lakhs. Is it due to mismanagement? Secondly at the time when the Government was in charge of this trust they never invested any money over the purchase of property or any accumulating fund for the devasthanam. But we find that since the Mahant came to be in charge of the trust, the trust has been considerably enlarged and it owns landed properties in several taluks. Thirdly, as regards education and social amenities, there are two educational institutions, one in Tirupati and another in Vellore, and both of them are running on up-to-date lines. Anyone who goes there will observe that both of them are fit to be raised to the status of a first grade college. When the Mission institution at Tirupati was abolished, an application was made to the devasthanam that Muhammadan students should be admitted into the devasthanam institutions which was granted, and from thence Muhammadan students were freely admitted into those institutions. (Mr. Schamnad: Hear, hear.) Another inmprovement is that the whole of the hills has now been electrified. That is to say, people can go up and down at any time of the night without fear of any kind. About Rs. 40,000 is expected to be the net return. The Municipality of Tirupati is now wanting to supply the town with electricity from the devasthanam plant, and there are other consumers also, so that the devasthanam stands to gain by this electrification scheme. Then, I may mention the many choultries built on a large scale for the accommodation of pilgrims and every attempt is made to cater to the intellectual, physical, and moral wants of the people going there. Does this not mean the exercise of discretion on the part of the trustee? If a Commissioner were to be appointed in his place, will he have the experience, sympathy and understanding that are required for the purpose of meeting the wants of the people there? I will request the House to take into consideration all these facts and not be guided by one-sided versions. A man who is considered excellent in one linen may have equal deficiencies in the other. Any number of rules andin legislations cannot create an ideal man. The appointment of a Commissioner will in no way solve the problem. We have a Board of foun Commissioners for Endowments, and they might have gone there anor

31st October 1931] [Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar]

sat down and laid their fingers on certain defects. That kind of thing won't meet the wants of the people. What is wanted is larger understanding and spiritual perception. I do not mean to say that the institution is run on model lines. But so long as a human being is in charge of the administration, there will be defects and need for improvement. But you must take the rose along with the thorns. Probably you may work out a scheme of the most wonderful type in the Select Committee. (Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar: You are also there.) This is a religious institution and it has been going on for a long time; that shows there is a power behind which keeps it going. So, let us not put one more log of wood in the way of the administration of this devasthanam. We want the spiritual power to be retained. The spiritual power is wielded for the sake of the whole of India and I will not be a party to any proceeding which will curtail it in the least degree. In spite of the Religious Endowments Board, there are many temples in Southern India which are a disgrace to our land. Why has this institution alone come to the forefront? I daresay that no man that you are going to appoint can clean the Aegean stables. He will prove to be a dismal failure and will bring down the spiritual institution to the level of an Aegean stable which it will take many years to cleanse. Living in Chittoor district, being in the midst of affairs and having watched the institution for 30 years, with the weight of the knowledge I possess, I must say it requires the greatest prudence and considerable wisdom and deep foresight to find out a man who will be able to answer to our expectations.

"Certainly it is no easy task. So, why not say, in the first clause 3-15 p.m. of the Bill itself, that you do not want the institution of Mahantship any longer and that hereafter the Hathiramji Mutt should have nothing to do with the devasthanams. It would have been better and saner to adopt that course than this course of saying in a roundabout way that you will make the Mahant a zero. The Mahant's spiritual claim is undoubted. Rightly understood, spirituality means efficient capacity to administer. Spirituality does not mean growing a beard and sitting in a corner of the mutt. (Voices: 'Hear, hear.') Spirituality has in it an effective dynamic force. A man who is to occupy the post of spiritual head of a large community should be in a position to set an example to the world. Are you going to find a Commissioner of that kind? I have no doubt you will fail. If you want to reform the institution, you have at hand the provisions of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act which can be exploited to the full. If you do that, you can make the institution 1,000 times better than what it is now. If you are incapable of utilizing those provisions, I am not certainly going to subscribe to the theory that further powers are necessary. Anyhow, Sir, I have no objection to the Bill being referred to a Select Committee, but I firmly believe that the provisions for the appointment of the Commissioner and the 15 members though they look well on paper will not easily lend themselves to be translated into action."

[31st October 1931

Mrs. A. Alamelumanga Thayarammal :—" திருமலை தேவஸ்தான சீர்திருத்த மசோதா விஷயமாய் இச்சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர் பலரும் பேசினார்கள். இந்த திருப்பதி தேவஸ்தானம் மிகமதிப்புள்ளது. தென்னிந்தியாவிலுள்ள தேவஸ்தானங்களில் மிகப்பெரிய விசேஷமான வைஷ்ணவ ஸ்தலம். அதற்குச் சொத்து கோடிக்கணக்காயிருக்குமென்று கூறுகின்றார்கள். லக்ஷக்கணக்கான திரவியம் உண்டியில் சேர்வதற்கு அநேக லக்ஷக்கணக்கான யாத்திரீகர்கள் வருவதே காரணமாகும். யாத்திரை வாசிகளுக்குள் அதிகமாய் தென்னாட்டினர்களும், வடநாட்டினர் குறைவாயும் வருகிறார்களென்றே சொல்லவேண்டும். சுவாமிக்குக் காணிக்கைகள் செலுத்துபவர்கள் தென்னாட்டினராவர். இந்நாட்டிலிருக்கும் ஏழைகளும், பிரபுக்களும், கற்றவர்களும், கல்லாதவர்களும், தரித்திரர்கள் முதற்கொண்டு தனவந்தர்கள்வரை யாவரும் கடவுளின் கடாக்ஷத்தைப் பெருவதற்குச் செலுத்தும்பணம் வீணில் செலவழிக்காமல் பாதுகாக்கவேண்டுமென்பதே சீர்திருத்த மசோதாவினால் உண்டாகவேண்டிய நன்மையாயிருக்கின்றது என்பதே எனது அபிப்பிராயமாகவிருக்கின்றது. இப்பொழுது ஒருவாறு காலம் மாறி வருகின்றது. ஏற்றத்தாழ்வின்றிச் சகலரும் சமமென்று சொல்லிவருகின்றோம். ஜனநாயகமென்று சொல்வதிற் சுகிர்தமில்லை. சொல்வதற்கேற்றபடி வேலை செய்யவேண்டும். சுவாமிக்குப் பிரார்த்தனை செய்துகொண்டு பொன்னும், வெள்ளியும், தங்க நகைகளும், தட்டுமுட்டுச் சாமான்களும் வேண்டியமட்டும் வந்து குவிகின்றன. அவைகளிலிருந்து சுவாமிக்குச் செய்யவேண்டிய நித்திய பூஜைக்கும், நீதியான உற்சவ ஊர்கோலங்களுக்கும் செலவிட்டதுபோக மிகுந்த சொத்தைக்கொண்டு நாட்டிற்குவேண்டிய பலநற்காரியங்களுக்குதவி செய்யலாம். எனக்கு முன்பேசிய சகோதர அங்கத்தினர் தேவஸ்தான சொத்திலிருந்து வேலூரிலும், திருப்பதியிலும் பாடசாலைகளை வைத்துநடத்தி வருகின்றார்கள் என்றும், மகம்மதிய பிள்ளைகளையும் மதபேதமின்றி அந்தப் பாடசாலைகளில் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ளுகிறார்களென்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார்கள். சுவாமி மனைவியே பூபி நாச்சியாராகையால் இதில் புதுமையொன்றுமில்லை. வைஷ்ணவ சமயம் ஜாதி சமயபேதமின்றி எல்லாரையும் ஒன்றுபடுத்தவந்த சமயமென்பதை யாவரும் அறிவர். கோயில் சொத்தைக்கொண்டு நம் நாட்டிற்கு முக்கியமாய் வேண்டிய கல்வியைப் பரவச் செய்யலாம். இப்போது தேவஸ்தானத்திலிருந்து இரண்டொரு பாடசாலைகளுக்காக செலவழிப்பது விசேஷமல்ல. மேனாட்டிலிருக்கும் ஆக்ஸ்போர்ட், கேம்பிரிட்ஜ் முதலிய சர்வ கலாசாலைகளைப்போல வைத்து நடத்த முயலவேண்டும். பலரிடமிருந்து வரும் பணத்தை நல்வழியில் பலரும் அனுபவிக்கச் செய்ய வேண்டும். கடவுளுக்குச் செய்வதெல்லாம் நமக்கு நன்மையளிக்க வேண்டுமென்று செய்வதேயாகும். ஆதலால் பொது ஜனங்களுக்கு வேண்டிய உத்தம காரியங்களுக்கு அத்திரவியத்தைச் செலவிடப்பார்க்கவேண்டும். பாஷை வேஷங்களில் வேறுபட்ட இந்நாட்டினரல்லாத வடநாட்டிலிருந்த பைராகிகள் வசமாயிற்று. அவர்கள் மகந்துக்களென்றும் சொல்வார்கள். கௌரவ தலைவர்களாகி கோவில் சொத்தை சத்வினியோகம் செய்யாமலிருந்திருக்கிறார்களென்று சில ஆண்டுகளுக்கு முன்பே பலரும் அறிந்திருக்கின்றனர். அவர்கள்பேரில் பலவிதமான குற்றங்குறைகள் முன்பே வெளிப்பட்ட விஷயம். இக்காலத்திலுங்கூட கோவில் சம்பந்தமான விவகாரங்கள் அடிக்கடி கோர்ட்டு கச்சேரிகளில் நடந்து வருகின்றன. இவ்விஷயம் என்னைவிட வக்கீல்களாகிய சட்டசபை சகோதர அங்கத்தினர்கள் நன்கறிவார்கள். கோர்ட்டுகளில் விவகாரங்கள் நடத்தும் காலத்தில் சுவாமியைப் பற்றியும், கோயிலைப்பற்றியும், ஆகம தந்திரங்களைப்பற்றியும் அடிக்கடி பேசிவருவது கடவுளை பூஜிப்பதாகாது. உண்மையான பக்தி செலுத்துவோருமாகமாட்டோம். இனிமேலாவது அம்மாதிரி நடைபெறாமல் கமிஷன் மூலமாகவும், கமிட்டி மூலமாகவும் நன்கு விசாரணைசெய்து கோர்ட்டுகளுக்கு வீண்செலவு செய்யவிடாமல் பாதுகாக்கவேண்டும். சகல ஜனங்களுக்கும் அனுகூலமான வழியில் திருப்பதி தேவஸ்தான சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தி அமைக்கவேண்டும். பொதுவாய் தேவஸ்தானச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவந்த இராஜா இராமராயநிங்கார் அவர்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயமும் நல்லபிப்பிராயமேயாகும். வீண் விவகாரங்களுக்கு அதிகமாய் இனி இடங்கொடாமலிருக்கவேண்டும். வீண் செலவுகளை நிறுத்த வேண்டும். சிக்கனம் சிக்கனம் என்று எங்கும் ஒரே பேச்சாயிருந்துவரும் இக்காலத்தில் கோவில் பணத்தை வீணாக்கப்படாது. பிரஜைகளுக்குப் பயன்படும்படி

31st October 1931] [Mrs. A. Alamelumanga Thayarammal]

செய்வதுதான் சுவாமிக்கும் பிரீதியான காரியம். ஆதலால் திருமலை தேவஸ்தான மசோதா சீர்திருத்தம் பெற்று, நாட்டிற்கு நன்மை யளிக்கவேண்டிய வழியில் வேலை செய்யவேண்டுமென்றே ஆதரிக்கின்றேன்."

Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM:—"கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே! எங்களுக்கும் இந்த பில்லில் உரிமை இருக்கிறது. திருமலை திருப்பதிக்குத் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்களும் ஏராளமாகச் செல்கிறார்கள். ஏராளமாகக் காணிக்கைச் செலுத்துகிறார்கள். ஆனால் அவர்களுக்கு அங்கு பறபெருமாள் கோயிலென்று ஒன்றை ஏற்படுத்தியுள்ளார்கள். அந்தக் கோயில் பாழடைந்து சப்பாத்திக் காட்டால் சூழப்பட்டுள்ளது. ஆனால் காணிக்கைகளை மலையின் அடிவாரத்தில் யாதவ வகுப்பைச் சேர்ந்த ஒருவர் எடுத்துக் கொண்டு போகிறார். அது அவர்க்கு மிராசு பாத்தியமாம். திருப்பதி தேவஸ்தானத்திற்கு ஏராளமான வரும்படி வருகிறது. ஒரு ஜில்லா போர்டுக்கு எவ்வளவு வரும்படி வேண்டுமோ அவ்வளவிற்கும் அதிகமாக வருகிறது. ஒழுங்கான முறையில் நிருவாகஞ் செய்தால் பொது ஜனங்களுக்கு எவ்வளவோ நன்மை செய்யலாம். ஆதலால், இந்த பில் வரவேண்டுமென்று பொது ஜனங்கள் விரும்புகிறார்கள். நாங்கள் மிகவும் சந்தோஷமாக வரவேற்கிறோம்! மகந்தாக வருபவர் நல்லவராயிருக்கலாம் அவர் தனிமையாக நடத்துவதால் அவர் மீது பலர் கேஸ் எடுக்கவும் அவநம்பிக்கைக் கொள்ளவும் இடமுண்டாகிறது. அதற்காக ஒரு போர்டும் ஒரு காரிய கர்த்தாவும் ஏற்படுவது மிகவும் அவசியம். போர்டும் காரியகர்த்தாவும் மகந்துக்குப் பாது காப்பாயிருப்பார்கள். சில கனந்தங்கிய அங்கத்தினர்கள் பொது ஜன அபிப்பிராயத்தை தெரிய வேண்டுமென்றார்கள். பொது ஜனங்கள் பில் வேண்டுமென்றே விரும்புகிறார்கள். இக்கனந்தங்கிய சபையிலுள்ளவர்கள் பொது ஜனங்களால் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டவர்களே. நமது அபிப்பிராயமே பொது ஜன அபிப்பிராயமென்று கொள்ள வேண்டும். தற்காலம் குடியரசு வேண்டுமென்று நாடு விரும்புகிறது. மகந்து நிருவாகம் போர்டு முன்னிலையில் வரக்கூடாதென்பவர்கள் சுய ஆட்சி வேண்டாமென்பவர்களே. கடவுள் செயலன்றி ஒரணுவும் அசையாது அவனது திருவுளப்பாங்காலேயே இந்த பில் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டுள்ளது. இதனை சர்க்குலேஷன்விட வேண்டாம். செலெக்ட் கமிட்டி மூலம் பரிசீலனை செய்து விரைவில் பில்லை ஆக்டாகக் கொண்டு வர வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, I beg to move that the question be now put."

Khan Bahadur YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur:—"I second it."

The closure motion was put and carried.

Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar's motion for circulation of the Bill for eliciting opinion was then put and lost.

Then, Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar's motion to suspend the operation of Standing Order 39 (2) and to refer his Bill to a Select Committee consisting of the Members proposed by him was put and carried. The Bill was referred to the Select Committee accordingly.

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS:—"Mr. President, under Standing Order 33 I beg to move—

'*that items 2 to 15 on the Agenda be postponed and that the House do proceed to consider item 16*'"

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"I second it." 3-30 p.m.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that all items up to item 16 be held over."

The motion was carried.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

V.—ANNOUNCEMENT *RE* THE APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN TO CERTAIN SELECT COMMITTEES ON BILLS.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" I have to announce that I nominate Mr. W. M. Browning as Chairman for the two Select Committees regarding the Madras Gaming (Amendment) Bill and the Madras City Police (Amendment) Bill.

" I nominate Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed as Chairman of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Madras Elementary Education Act, 1920."

IV—BILLS—*cont.*

(1) THE TIRUMALAI-TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS BILL—*cont.*

Discussion was then resumed on the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Bill.

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Mr. President, Sir, I welcome the introduction of a Bill, the object of which is to ensure efficient management and popular control of the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams. In order to justify an object of that sort and the consequent introduction of a Bill to ensure the accomplishment of that object, it does not seem to be necessary for anybody to allege acts of mismanagement and much less to prove them against the present Vicharanakartha. It is enough, Sir, if the public opinion is in favour of preparedness to take the management of a big religious institution like the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams and make such provisions to effectuate that object. Therefore the fact that a suit is pending in a court of law for framing a scheme or for making amendments in the existing Scheme which governs the management of that institution need not act as an impediment for the legislature to go on with this Bill. Any day I am of opinion that control of a popular body of any big institution is much more dependable and much less susceptible to corruptions and autocracy than the management of such institution by a single individual. Probably the individual trustees themselves of temples, hereditary or nominated, might sometimes feel the necessity of assistance of the members of the public who are interested in that institution.

" Though as many as seven or eight hon. Members of this Council have given notice of Bills affecting the proper management of these devasthanams, it is practically one Bill that we have got to deal with. Therefore this House is denied the enlightenment that it would have derived had the Bills been the result of individual thinking of each of the hon. Members who have given notice of this Bill. Presumably all the Bills are drafted by a single author and it is whispered, Sir, that the Bill is the result of considerable thinking in the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. If my presumption is correct, it would have been indeed a very convenient matter for this Council, had that Bill been sponsored by the Government. The Government had been anxious to make improvements in the management of this temple for a considerably long time. When the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was before the legislature, it was thought that the Act aimed particularly at this devasthanam. But owing to some cause or another it was not possible

(2) A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS MEDICAL REGISTRATION ACT, 1914.

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS :—" I beg leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Medical Registration Act, 1914."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS :—" I introduce the Bill."

(3) THE MARUMAKKATTAYAM BILL.

* Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR :—" I move that the Marumakkattayam Bill[a] (Bill No. 13 of 1931) be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

(1) The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
(2) The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
(3) Dr. P. Subbarayan.
(4) Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
(5) Mr. C. Krishnan.
(6) Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal.
(7) Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
(8) B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.
(9) Mr. R. M. Palat.
(10) Mr. A. B. Shetty.
(11) Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
(12) Mr. F. E. James.
(13) Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
(14) Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
(15) Myself.

" Sir, I think it is necessary to briefly indicate the necessity for a legislation of this kind and the lines on which legislation is proposed. The communities governed by the Marumakkattayam and Aliyasantana law have been asking for the legal recognition of the customary marital unions prevailing among them. The Malabar Act of 1896 was passed in response to this demand. But that legislation is a very imperfect measure and has failed to meet the requirements of the people concerned. It does not legalise the sambandham, but provides for the optional registration of marital unions to invest them with validity. The refusal of the Court to regard the sambandham as a legal marriage has stamped one of the most enlightened classes in this country as an inferior race and prevented it from growing to its fullest natural stature. The Bill seeks to invest the sambandham with all the incidents of legal marriage. This may, in theory, look like a great departure from the existing state of things, but it is in truth no more than giving a formal legal sanction to what, in practice, is regarded as a sacred and lifelong union. Apart from marriage and inheritance, the need for a law providing for partition has long been felt. The tarwads have expanded beyond all natural limits so much so that it is often

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 18th August 1931.

31st October 1931] [Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar]

difficult to trace the exact relationship of the members composing them. The consequence has been ruinous litigation. There is hardly a family of substance in Malabar that is not in the courts. Suits for maintenance instituted by the junior members are a common feature of Marumakkattayam and Aliyasantana life. There are instances of crimes committed on account of family quarrels. The Bill endeavours to remedy this evil by providing for partition in rather a conservative fashion. It does not create the right to individual partition, but only to tavazhi partition. Personally I stand for individual partition and I am also aware that there are a good many people in Malabar who demand individual partition. But partly as a concession to orthodox opinion, and partly by way of abundant caution, only tavazhi partition has been provided for. The Bill that has been introduced by my hon. Friend, Mr. Palat, also provides for tavazhi partition. But his Bill excludes from its operation the Rajas and Sthanies. I have not excluded them. But there is a provision in my Bill allowing any tarwad to remain impartible in case not less than two-thirds of the major members of any tarwad desire to remain impartible. But if my hon. Friend, Mr. Palat, who is the accredited representative in this House of the Rajas and Sthanies of Malabar, thinks that the position I have taken up is not enough so far as Rajas and Sthanies are concerned, I have not the slightest hesitation in accepting his view.

"Mr. President, the need for such a legislation as this was felt years ago. Two eminent sons of Malabar who are important members of this House—I refer to the Law Member and my hon. Friend, Mr. K. P. Raman Menon—had introduced Marumakkattayam Bills, which elicited a volume of opinion in its favour, even in pre-reform Legislative Councils. The Bill that I have introduced is, except for a few minor verbal alterations, the same Bill that was introduced into the third Legislative Council by Mr. K. Madhavan Nayar and had met with popular approval. I, therefore, hope that this Bill will meet with the active sympathy and hearty co-operation of the whole House. To the hon. the Law Member, who is the Government Member in charge of this Bill, I would earnestly appeal in the name of Malabar, which had stood very loyally by him in all his elections, to facilitate the passage of this Bill, which he fully knows is the cry of Malabar to-day."

* Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"I have great pleasure in seconding this motion. In doing so, I wish to lay before you some two or three aspects which have not been referred to by the hon. Mover. Firstly, I may say that this Bill is of very urgent necessity from an economic point of view in addition to the legal inconvenience from which the people have been suffering. I may say that the present system of management by Ejaman who has absolutely no interest in the property of the tarwad beyond taking everything that is possible for him to take from the property is very detrimental to the tarwad property. The economic development of the family property suffers, because once a member becomes Ejaman of the property he grabs as much as he can

[Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt] [31st October 1931

from the tarwad property and hordes up as much as he can for his wife and children. He does not care to spend a single pie of the surplus income which he may get for the improvement of the tarwad property and the property goes to rack and ruin. Secondly there are the junior members of the families. It may be said that the junior members of the families may spend some money and energy for the improvement of the tarwad property. They too do not; because so long as they get for their maintenance, they do not care for the tarwad property and they have no further interest in it. After all, Sir, the junior members of the families would come into management very remotely, and perhaps may not come in at all within their lifetime in most cases. Sir, this system of law was prevalent when marriage was not a recognized institution. Now marriage has come to be thought of as a well established social institution. Why not give it a legal recognition too? I therefore submit that this system of law which is now prevailing in Malabar and South Kanara should be changed. The sooner it is changed the better it will be for all concerned. I submit, Sir, when it is known that a Bill was introduced by the hon. the Law Member and another also by Mr. Raman Menon, a third by Mr. Madhavan Nayar in the third reformed Council and if again this is introduced for a fourth time, it establishes a case for such a measure beyond all doubt. I submit that the sooner it goes to the Select Committee and it is thrashed out, the better. The people in Malabar and South Kanara are crying for a legislation of this kind. I do hope that the House will consider this aspect of the question and will see that the Bill is referred to a Select Committee.

" With these few words I second the motion."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I have given notice of an amendment to this motion and it reads thus:—

'*That the Marumakkattayam Bill (Bill No.* 13 *of* 1931) *be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.*'

" My hon. Friends of this Council will understand that this is a piece of social legislation. Attempts are made in this Bill to introduce rights of partition and other rights which do not now exist among the communities that are governed by this law. According to the existing law, properties of these Marumakkattayam families and Aliyasantana families are impartible. One of the objects of this Bill is to give power to branches of these big families to demand compulsory partition of the family properties. Then again, there are other chapters in this Bill which deal with the question of guardianship, with the question of testate and intestate succession. According to the existing law, properties of these Marumakkattayam and Aliyasantana families descend in a particular way. There is an attempt made in this Bill to make these properties descend in other ways. There are also provisions in the Bill connected with the marriage question, which introduce changes in the existing customs of Nayars who are governed by the Marumakkattayam law and these changes will also apply to some people of the South

31st October 1931] [Sir M. Krishnan Nayar]

Kanara district, who are governed by the Aliyasantana system of inheritance. In addition to all these provisions, the Bill applies not only to two communities, viz., the Nayars and the people governed by Aliyasantana system of law, but it applies also to all Hindus who are governed by Marumakkattayam law. I may say for the information of this House there are other communities in addition to Nayars who are governed by Marumakkattayam law. For instance the Tiyas whose community consists of many enlightened members are governed in parts of Malabar district by the Marumakkattayam law. There are, again, certain classes of temple servants who are governed by this system of law. There are also certain classes of Brahmans who are governed by the Marumakkattayam law. My hon. Friend wants to apply the provisions of this Bill not only to the members of these communities, but also to some non-Marumakkattayam Hindus. I do not want to say anything about the merits of the Bill or the desirability or otherwise of passing this measure, at the present stage. What I say is that this measure is a piece of social legislation. Government, before making up their minds as to the attitude which they should take, should have materials before them, i.e., the opinions of the members of the communities concerned.

"I had an informal conversation with my friends of the Marumakkattayam community in this Council and they said that if I could give an undertaking that the opinions of the community and the persons that would be affected by the Bill would be obtained by the Government before a particular date, say, the 5th or 10th of January next, so that they might consider them before the next meeting of the Council, they would have no objection to the amendment that I have moved now. I give that undertaking now on the floor of the House. I shall issue instructions to the effect that the opinions of the members of the community should be elicited and that they should reach the Government before the 5th or the 10th of January next. After they are received they will be printed and placed before the House. I do not wish to make a long speech at this stage. With these observations I move the amendment." 3-45 p.m.

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The amendment before the House is that the Marumakkattayam Bill (Bill No. 13 of 1931) be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon. Both the original motion and the amendment are now before the House for discussion."

* Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"I do not want to oppose the amendment of the hon. the Law Member. I believe that materials on this question had already been collected and the opinions of the communities affected by this Bill must have been obtained when the hon. the Law Member as well as Mr. Raman Menon sought to introduce similar Bills in this Council in the pre-reform days. We shall be much obliged to the Government if they make those materials available to us now. This

[Mr. A. B. Shetty] [31st October 1931

Bill was introduced three months ago and there was ample time for the Government to call for information and know the views of the people concerned in this matter. I do not see why they should have been indifferent and slept over this matter so long. What is the procedure they are now going to follow in eliciting public opinion—in choosing persons who will be asked to give their views on this matter? To whom will this Bill be sent for remarks? I am afraid if this Bill is referred only to karnavans and adverse opinions are received, it would be an effective way of damning it even at the beginning. Government should elicit the opinion of all parties interested in this matter, not merely of the karnavans but also of the junior members of families. I do not know whether arrangements will be made for calling public meetings and ascertaining popular opinion regarding this Bill. In South Kanara we have been holding public meetings and ascertaining the views of the pepole affected by this legislation. We have held meetings of Bunts and Billavans and Marumakkattayam people belonging to Kasaragod taluk. I do not propose at this stage to tell the House what views people in South Kanara have expressed in regard to this Bill. (Hear, hear.) It is not necessary to go into it now. I would only request the hon. the Law Member to see that this Bill is sent for opinion to a representative body of people, to publish the opinions collected and place them on the table of the House. If possible arrangements may also be made for holding public meetings and eliciting the opinion of the public on the Bill."

* Mr. C. KRISHNAN :—" I fully support this Bill."

* Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR :—" In view of the undertaking given by the hon. the Law Member that he would make arrangements for eliciting public opinion on the Bill before the 5th or the 10th January I do not propose to press my motion for referring the Bill to a Select Committee. I accept his amendment."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" May I say one word, Sir, at this stage before you put the motion to the House? My Friend, Mr. Shetty, referred to the materials collected in connection with a Bill which he says I introduced some time ago. I remember to have introduced some measure about 25 years ago when I happened to be a member of this Council as it was then constituted. I do not think it proceeded far because I left the Council for another part of south India. Mr. Raman Menon's Bill also was introduced many years ago and I do not know whether opinions were collected then and even if they were collected whether they are now in existence.

" If lists of persons to whom the Bill should be circulated are furnished to me, I shall certainly consider them. I may not personally know all the persons in the list; therefore, I hope that my friend will be careful to include in the list persons who are likely to be in favour of the Bill as well as those who are likely to be opposed to the Bill. In addition to this, I shall also ask the Collectors of Malabar and South Kanara to select persons to whom this Bill should be sent.

31st October 1931] [Sir M. Krishnan Nayar]

" As for holding public meetings, I am afraid it is beyond Government. It is for my hon. Friend to hold meetings and send the resolutions passed by them to Government for information. In fact, this is one of the ways in which my friend can help Government. Let him arrange to hold meetings in various parts of the country, of people who are in favour of the Bill and of people who are against the Bill, and send their opinions to Government. Such opinions are likely to reflect the opinion of the community and they will be of considerable help to Government."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Mr. Hameed Khan may move his amendment now."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" I formally move—

' *that the Marumakkattayam Bill (Bill No. 13 of 1931) of Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon and that such opinion be obtained and placed on the table of the House before the next meeting of the Council* '."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur :—" I second it."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The date of the next meeting has not been fixed. It may be after the 10th of January. As I have said before, I undertake to get the opinions of the persons concerned before the 5th or the 10th of January. After getting the opinions of the persons concerned, I shall print them and place them before hon. Members. In the light of these remarks I hope my hon. Friend will not press his amendment."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" I do not press my amendment; I hope the opinions will be received before the 5th January."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that Bill No. 13 of 1931 be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon."

The motion was carried.

(4) THE NAMBUDIRI BILL

* Mr. P. MADHUSOODHANAN THANGAL :—" Mr. President, Sir, I rise to move that the Nambudiri Bill[a] (Bill No. 14 of 1931) be referred to a Select Committee. Before I do so, may I, Sir, now with your kind permission make a few observations, regarding the necessity for legislation on the lines proposed by me.

" My Bill does not propose to introduce any revolutionary change. The whole Bill centres round one question, i.e., whether all Nambudiri males should be allowed to marry within caste. If this question is to be answered in the affirmative, then the Bill has to be accepted. The only other important question involved in the Bill is whether a member should have the right to ask for his share of the family properties. I do not think that any one would give a negative answer to this question. There may be some people who think whether their right to partition is not likely to be abused. It is to appease them that certain restrictions have been imposed on the exercise of their right. The greatest disease

[a] Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 18th August 1931.

[Mr. P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal] [31st October 1931

of the community now is unemployment and lack of education. Though the Nambudiris are an intelligent race and though there are many rich families among them, you can count on your fingers the number of Nambudiris who have availed themselves of the present system of education. On account of this backwardness in education, they continue to be the strongholds of superstition and orthodoxy and retard the progress of even other communities. Would you believe if I say that, in this year of Grace 1931, there are people who would excommunicate their relations for the great sin of having allowed their women to have cloth umbrellas or wear jackets to cover their nudity or to wear a pair of gold bangles? And won't you lend me your helping hand if I say that such things have taken place just a couple of months ago and I want to prevent their repetition? If this Bill is accepted and with the goodwill of the House, is allowed to be put on the statute book, then, in a few years' time the Nambudiris shall work a miracle. The Yogakshema Sabha, the accredited organization of the Nambudiris, has been asking for legislation in the above matters for some time. The Nambudiri Yuvajana Sabha which is the organization of the Nambudiri youths has been clamouring for more radical things. Mr. O. M. Narayanan Nambudiripad, who was a member of the last Council, drafted a Bill and obtained the permission of the Viceroy; but for some reasons did not introduce it. At the last annual sessions of the Yogakshema Sabha and the Yuvajana Sabha I was asked to introduce a Bill for the above purposes in this Council, and it is in pursuance of that mandate, and at the request of innumerable individual Nambudiri gentlemen, that I seek to introduce this Bill.

"Before concluding, let me make mention that a similar necessity was felt at Travancore and the Nambudiris there have succeeded in getting a Bill passed in the Travancore Legislative Council, and I am glad to tell you that the Maharani Regent has kindly assented to it recently, and the Bill is in force now. So, in the name of thousands of Nambudiri women, who are rotting behind the parda, in the name of the Nambudiri race, which is rapidly decaying in ignorance and superstition, and in the name of a healthy family life, I beseech you to accept this Bill and allow it to be referred to the Select Committee, composed of the following members:—

(1) The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
(2) The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
(3) Dr. P. Subbarayan.
(4) Mr. H. R. Pate.
(5) Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
(6) Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
(7) Mr. R. M. Palat.
(8) Mr. C. Krishnan.
(9) Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
(10) Mr. A. B. Shetty.
(11) Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
(12) Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
(13) B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.
(14) Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
(15) Myself."

31st October 1931]

* Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" Mr. President, Sir, though I do not belong to the Nambudiri community which is concerned in this Bill, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Thangal. I trust that the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee and that the hon. the Law Member will not come forward with a dilatory motion of the kind that he brought in connexion with the Bill that was just before us, namely, that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon. It is very regrettable that Government should adopt this obstructionist and defeatist policy with regard to measures brought by private members. I do not see what the Council is here for, if non-official members are not given opportunities to move and bring forward Bills on matters with which they are concerned.

" The hon. Mover of this motion has explained in detail the objects of this Bill and its very important provisions. At this stage I feel it is not necessary for me to go any further into the detailed points on which this Bill has got a bearing. I would conclude by earnestly requesting the hon. the Law Member once over, not to move any motion for circulating the Bill for eliciting public opinion." 4 p.m.

(As it was then 4 o'clock, the adjournment motion was taken up.)

VI.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* THE CONDUCT OF REVENUE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT AT ELLORE.

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move that the business of the Council be adjourned for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz.—

> '*the conduct of the Revenue Officers of the Government at the public meeting held at the Young Men's Hindu Association, Ellore, on the 18th October* 1931.'

" Sir, I feel I must preface the few remarks that I am going to make in this connexion, by an apology to the Council for venturing to adjourn the business of this House by a motion instead of being satisfied with the answers that might be elicited by putting interpellations to the Government. My experience of the last 7 years of this Council has taught me that invariably on questions of importance and public interest, the Government have no information on the interpellations put by non-officials. When the Members of the Government are attacked by a fusilade of supplementary questions, they hesitate to consider the advisability of calling for information. In fact that reluctant acceptance to agree to consider the suggestion for calling for further information is not generally followed up by action unless there is the prospect of a resolution or adjournment motion coming up for discussion in the Council. When such motions or resolutions are tabled, the Government have the particular knack of defeating the purpose by metaphysical arguments or by mechanised majorities. But if these resolutions are backed up by a consensus of opinion from all sections of the House, then the Government show a tendency to agree to consider the subject-matter of the motion and thus effectively persuade the movers of the motions to withdraw them. I must admit that hon. Members of this House, to whatever section of the House they may belong, are always

ready to agree to withdraw motions provided they see even a ray of a conciliatory attitude on the part of the Government. If, in spite of the numerous infantile diseases that beset non-official resolutions, we are able to carry a resolution in spite of the opposition of the Government, then they do not give effect to the resolution justifying their action because of the persistent attitude of the non-official Members in passing that resolution. Therefore, Sir, we might be excused if, in spite of the fact that there is the opportunity of eliciting the Government point of view by putting interpellations, we persist in wasting the time of the Council by bringing forward resolutions or adjournment motions. But I may assure the hon. Members of the Government that there is absolutely no intention on the part of any hon. Member of this House to waste the time of the Council, because with the waste of the time of the Council, one's own individual time is wasted. Knowing, as we do, the professions and occupations in which hon. Members of the House are engaged, it must be rather incredible to believe that they can afford to waste their time by moving motions which would prove to be ineffective.

"With this apology, Sir, I move this motion. In regard to this particular motion I am further handicapped by the fact that this is perhaps the first time I am referring to the conduct of individual officers of the Government. It is no pleasant task to any hon. Member of this House to indulge in attacks against Government officers who are not present here to refute the arguments or allegations made against them. If, in spite of all these handicaps, I feel impelled to bring to the notice of the Government the conduct of particular officers of the Government, it is more in the interest of peace and order and contentment of the people affected than in feeling any pleasure by indulging in personal attacks and recriminations. The officer concerned in this matter is one Mr. Venkataramana Rao Nayudu, Deputy Collector of Ellore. I understand that Mr. Mothay Ganga Raju who was a Member of the Legislative Council in the year 1926 as a representative of the Congress Party which swamped the elections then and who was sitting on this side of the House, issued invitations convening a public meeting of ryots of the West Godavari district in order to publish the truth about the resettlement proposals. The notice convening the meeting was printed in Telugu so that the ryots, who are all Telugu people, may understand the purpose for which the meeting was organized. I have myself seen a copy of this notice and I can say unhesitatingly that it cannot be said that that meeting was organized to represent a particular point of view and that it was not open to those who differed from that point of view. When this notice was sent, it was accompanied by a letter signed by the Deputy Collector addressed to individuals asking them to be present at the meeting. I can understand officers of the Government taking the trouble of explaining the policy of the Government to the ryots by directly calling for a conference of the ryots or by themselves going to the residences of the ryots or places of public resort and explaining the matter. But I cannot surely reconcile myself to the position which this Government officer occupies when he enclosed with the invitation of a public man his own letter asking the ryots to be present. Is the public to understand that the meeting was organized by one

31st October 1931] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

amongst themselves in order to know the truth about resettlement proposals or that the meeting was one in which Government officers alone were going to be allowed to speak correctly or incorrectly? That was the dilemma in which the public were, as the notice of the meeting was accompanied by the letter from the Deputy Collector. Granting that that was permissible, what do we find later on? A large number of people assembled in the hall, numbering about a thousand, amongst whom there were many ryots. My friend Mr. Mothay Gangarazu proposed, as the convenor of the meeting, Mr. Venkataramana Rao Nayudu to the chair. Thus he became the chairman of the meeting. He is a Deputy Collector; and now he is the chairman of a meeting convened by a resident of the locality. As the chairman of the meeting, he began with his introductory speech and he took care to say that the meeting was organized for the purpose of explaining the truth about the resettlement rates. If he had anticipated what was to take place afterwards in the meeting, he would have taken care to say that the meeting was organized to explain the Government point of view on resettlement proposals. Every one in that district, I daresay, is too painfully aware he therefore said at the beginning that the meeting was organized to explain the truth about the resettlement proposals. At the entrance to this meeting place, there was a big placard of welcome welcoming everybody to come to the meeting and to hear the truth about the resettlement proposals. We are familiar with the truth about the resettlement proposals. Every one in that district, I dare say, is too painfully aware of the truth about the resettlement rates; they need no reminder from this Deputy Collector; they must have watched the resettlement operations which took place against the protest of the public and of this Council. They must be aware that subsequently the Government, as a concession which is very unusual, generously agreed to the constitution of an Economic Enquiry Committee to enquire into the economic condition of these districts. They must also be aware that that distinguished Committee refuted every statement that was made by the Settlement Officer and came to different conclusions from those of the Settlement Officer. The Committee reported to the Government that the enhancement of the rates was unwarranted and that great hardship would be caused. They were also aware that the Government did not pass orders on the report of the Economic Enquiry Committee and that they delayed it as long as possible. They were also aware that many protests were made by means of interpellations, resolutions and adjournment motions in this Council, in order to impress on the attention of the Government the necessity of not levying the enhanced rates. They were also aware of the prevaricating answers which the Government gave without saying definitely whether they would levy these enhanced rates from this year or not. They were also aware of the latest reply of the hon. the Revenue Member that the $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent would be distributed among three years, that he had not yet made up his mind whether he would levy any enhanced rate this year and that he would call for reports from these districts to see whether the economic condition of the people would justify the levy of the enhanced rate. It is this vagueness and it is this indefiniteness that compelled the people of these districts to kept up an agitation.

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [31st October 1931

4-15 p.m. " Well, Sir, if the Government were not convinced of the necessity of suspending these rates, having regard to the existing state of affairs of those districts, what else could possibly convince the Government? Naturally, therefore, the ryots were interested to see that they sent up protests, petitions and appeals to the Government to suspend these rates. Well, the Government might have been well-intentioned in asking District Collectors to forward reports on the economic condition; but the Government ought also to be aware from their long experience that they have got officers whose zeal always outruns their discretion. It is to that category that our friend, Mr. Venkataramana Rao Nayudu, belongs; and it is due to the conduct of such officers, Sir, that the Government is brought into disaffection, ridicule and contempt. If to-day there is dissatisfaction against the administration of this Government, it is due more to the misguided zeal and enthusiasm of some of its officers.

" Now, turning to the history of that meeting, I am to say that, as the President was speaking, Mr. Dandu Narayana Raju, a Member of the Legislative Council in the last Council, a member of the Economic Enquiry Committee and the Secretary of the Ryots Association, stood up from his seat and asked the President if, in regard to the exposition of the truth about the re-settlement proposals, anybody else would be entitled to speak. The President at once scented danger—because his statements would bear no scrutiny, no evidence, if only the other side began to open its mouth; and so the first step that he took was to silence the other side and that was by stating ' No, nobody else has power to speak excepting those who are called upon ', that is, excepting those who were selected by the President. He then proceeded with his speech and said that a propaganda for a no-tax campaign was being organized in the districts. That is a statement which affected the reputation and the methods of those who constituted themselves as the representatives of the ryots."

* Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA :—" Sir, I raise a point of order, there is a proceeding pending in a court of law. The whole proceedings at that meeting form the subject of a case before a court; and evidence will have to be let in on all these points. Under these circumstances, I think it is not admissible, when the case is *sub judice*, that those matters should be discussed here."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI : " I have not yet come to that line or boundary wherein it may be said that I am transgressing the rules or standing orders in regard to matters which are *sub judice*.

" Sir, I was saying that he would not allow Mr. D. Narayana Raju to proceed. Naturally, there was some hissing and confusion."

* Mr. F. E. JAMES :—" On a point of order, Sir. My friend on the opposite side of the House has placed a very important question before the House as to whether a reference to some of the incidents is admissible owing to the fact that the whole case is *sub judice*. The hon. Member himself admits that they are not admissible. I wish to suggest, Sir, to you, with respect, that the decision on the matter rests with you and you only. I should like to know whether that matter has received your attention."

31st October 1931]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. the Mover of the motion has himself answered the question, and I therefore thought that it was not necessary to give any ruling on that point."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Sir, I am only objecting to the Deputy Collector silencing the other point of view from being expressed in a meeting ostensibly for the purpose of propounding the truth of the resettlement proposals. Sir, I am only appealing to the Government to restrain these over-zealous officials, so that their action might not have the undesirable effect of fomenting discontent and agitation. We are passing through critical periods. It is the business both of the Government and of the public to see that no cause is given for grievance on either side. I am glad the Government is in a position to appreciate the difficulties from which these agriculturists are suffering. I have no doubt that with the same kind of attitude, they would come to the conclusion not to levy even that one anna rate for this year. I am speaking, Sir, in this strain because there does not seem to be any anxiety on the part of the Government to grind the poor agricultural ryot. They only want to know the truth. They are sometimes under the impression that too much is made of the economic depression. Probably, they are justified in trying to know the real truth. They will have the assistance of the public in their attempts to find out the truth. But instead of deputing that work to persons who seem to think that by collecting more revenue in these distressing circumstances, they would be pleasing the Government, they themselves must take the trouble of going to the districts and finding out the truth which would convince both the Government and the public of the justness of their claims. It is from that point of view that I am appealing to the Government. It is not with a view to make a complaint against a particular official. Probably there may be number of people who would like to follow that example so long as it would benefit their personal prospects. Sir, it will be impossible for me to think that the public of these districts are merely exaggerating or aggravating their difficulties when I see persons like my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataramayya Nayudu presiding over a meeting of the agricultural ryots protesting against the levy of these enhanced rates. To mention only one person, Mr. Venkataramayya Nayudu, who is a representative of that district, was the president of a meeting to protest against these enhancements. Having regard to the circumstances, having regard to the real nature of the conditions of the people, would it be possible to believe that there would be anybody of those agricultural ryots who would say that they agree to these enhanced rates, that they would invite the Government to levy these rates?—that would be too incredible to believe. So, any representation that may be made by any public meeting organized by any one who would favour the enhanced rates should be considered to be a cooked up one, a faked up thing, and not a real thing. I therefore appeal to the Government to know the truth of the matter and issue orders to their subordinate officers to be sympathetic to the people, not to add to the troubles of the Government which are already too many, by unnecesarily creating agitation by organizing counter-meetings and getting some people to support their

move. Sir, I have absolutely no malice against the particular officer in making this motion. I only want that we must be saved from any disastrous consequences that might follow. I do not want to refer to the proceedings launched against these gentlemen in a court of law. It is for the Government to say whether it would be in consonance with their declared intentions to help the ryot and agriculturist to go on with proceedings of that sort . . ."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Now, I am afraid that my hon. Friend is treading on forbidden ground. To make any observations regarding a pending case is not admissible; and my friend is as much aware as myself of the standing orders and the rules of the Legislative Council bearing on this."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" I shall take the advice of the hon. the Law Member. But still, Sir, I do not know if I have made any observations on the case before the Court. I request the Government to find out if it is desirable to go on with these prosecutions.

" With these observations, Sir, and a fervent appeal to the Government not to misunderstand the people but really to give a healthy and tonic restraint to their over-zealous officers to act and conduct themselves agreeably in the districts, I move this motion. That would, I think, more than repay the labours which this House has put forth in regard to the well-being of the ryots."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" Mr. President, it is indeed very unfortunate that some Members in this House have to bring forward motions of this nature, motions to adjourn the normal business of the House as it is understood, in order to discuss a matter of very urgent and recent importance. As has been stated by the Mover, none of us here comes to waste either his own time or the time of the House. If we bring forward adjournment motions, we do so under the standing orders. If an adjournment motion is made, it is not beyond the standing orders, and this every Member realizes. I daresay every Member of the House will agree with me when I say that we know our responsibilities. When we bring forward motions like this, we do so under great necessity.

" Mr. President, Sir, the motion is one of very great importance, because it affects the very people whom we seek to represent in this House. It is possible that those who are seated here in the Opposition may hold an opinion which may not be agreed to by Members of Government or those who support the Government. But yet, the Government follow one policy; the Government have to consider the prestige of their officers; they have to consider their own prestige. We have not the time or the opportunity, as Members of Government have, to know the truth about all things as they arise; but we do recognize that we have to support the Government in their actions whenever and wherever they do require to be supported. At the same time, there are certain actions of the Government which cannot be accepted by the

31st October 1931] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

real representatives of the people; because they know that the situation created by the actions of Government needs, in certain cases, criticism and representation in this House.

"Sir, this matter of resettlement, in the three districts of the Circars, has become an ancient affair. We have known how agitation has been carried on in the districts; and as a result of that agitation, representatives of those districts invited the attention of Government in this very House thereto. Government very wisely agreed to the appointment of an Enquiry Committee. The Enquiry Committee, on the agreement of the Government, went into the question, spent a lot of time over it and came to certain conclusions. After all, Sir, to whom and to which officer are the conclusions of this Enquiry Committee to be referred for report—to the very same officer, the same settlement officer who was carrying on his resettlement work before the Enquiry Committee was appointed? Was this the person to whom this report should be referred for report again? Sir, is that a proper procedure I ask? Is that, I say a righteous procedure? If the Government were really interested in the welfare of the people, they would have certainly referred this report to an independent officer—an officer who was not directly concerned with the resettlement work in those three districts. Sir, the Government depended upon his report, and depending upon his report, they have resolved to take a certain course of action. Well, when the Members of this Council came to know that the Government were going to take action in contradiction to the conclusions of the Enquiry Committee, a motion was tabled in this House, and it was passed, and that is that the Government should not give effect to their desires with regard to the re-settlement question.

"Sir, Government flouted the decision of this Council, went 4-30 p.m.
merrily along with their work and now they are face to face with a situation which I am sure from the way in which they or some of their officers are conducting themselves in those districts, is serious indeed. They found themselves helpless after the thing was done. If they felt that what was being done was the proper thing, certainly they would not have resorted to this method of holding public meetings, and sending out officers among the ryots in order ostensibly to explain as it were the truth of this resettlement affair. As a matter of fact, from analogies from other provinces we can easily observe that it is in order to coerce the ryot into paying the enhanced rates that this is done. This is the way in which the Government wishes to collect the rates from the poor ryots who are not able even to carry on the work of cultivation on account of the prevailing economic depression. Sir, we know that the Government says it wishes to explain the truth of it to the ryots so that they might not succumb to the agitation that a handful of people are carrying on in the province. Sir, I might ask the Government and such of my colleagues as are here whether it will be possible for a handful of people to carry on any agitation unless they know that the people are behind it. The ryots are behind it. It is at the instance of the ryots who feel that there is a real grievance in regard to this matter that conferences and public meetings are held. They are carrying on a consti-

tutional agitation in order to impress upon the Government that their point of view might be considered and that the Government might not enforce the enhanced resettlement rates. Sir, the Government say that they are not going to force the people to pay these enhanced rates immediately. But then, they don't realize that when a people find it difficult to pay even the existing rates on account of the economic conditions . . . . prevailing."

* Mr. F. E. JAMES :—" Sir, may I rise to a point of order? I do not want to interrupt the hon. Gentleman but I should like to ask you, Sir, whether in view of the fact that the adjournment motion deals with the conduct of the revenue divisional officer at a particular meeting on a particular date, it is in order to make a general review of the revenue settlement policy of the Government."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It is wrong to make a general review of the whole situation. I would request the hon. Member to confine his remarks to this particular motion."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" I bow to your ruling, Sir, but I would tell my hon. Friend who interrupted that if what was sought to be explained at the public meeting was the truth of the question, I want to tell the House what the truth was, whether what they said was the truth or was not the truth. Sir, the Government, as I said, was in a helpless condition. The Revenue Divisional Officer whose name was mentioned by the hon. Mover, that is, Mr. Venkataramana Rao Nayudu, was one of those present at that public meeting; and I understand that at that public meeting he was proposed to the chair. He was the president of the public meeting and he was there to explain on behalf of the Government the truth about the resettlement rates. Well, Sir, if there are any members in this House who, on account of their social relationship with that particular gentleman, want to come forward to take up his brief, to take up his cause, I wish to tell them that they have to place their public duty above their sympathy for their relations. We are here in this Council to represent the people. We are not here to represent our relations. Sir, if my relation has acted against the interests of the public . . ."

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA :—" Does this relate to the conduct of this officer, this homily? "

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Yes, Sir. If he is the relation of any one . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. The hon. Member will see that he confines his remarks to the conduct of the officer."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Sir, the Revenue Divisional Officer is also a Magistrate. He was there in his capacity of the Revenue Divisional Officer in order to explain to the ryots a matter purely concerning the revenue of the State. He was presiding there over a public meeting not called by him nor by any Government agency, but a public meeting called by a private individual, a citizen of that place.

31st October 1931] [Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan]

It might be by accident or by design that he was chosen to be the president of that meeting. I dare say it was an accident because he was supposed to be one of the leading persons at that meeting on that occasion. He was voted to the chair. He ought to have taken, as chairman of a public meeting where people had assembled holding different opinions, no point of view therein. It was his duty as chairman not to take any particular point of view, for as chairman it was his duty to remain neutral. It was his duty to allow all points of view to be expressed on the question which was being discussed at that meeting. On the other hand, we find that he becomes a partisan. He does not act as the elected chairman of a public meeting, but a partisan of a particular point of view. And when he becomes a partisan, that meeting did not remain a public meeting. He converted it into a meeting of his own. Of course the Government knows what has happened ultimately, and I do not wish to enter into the question which is considered to be forbidden on account of its being sub-judice (The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—' You can't '), on accounnt of certain rules which prevent me from going into them. But then the Government knows, all the public knows, what the result has been of the action of the Government. Sir, I should like to refer in this connection to the fact that the Banking Enquiry Committee have supported the conclusions of the Economic Enquiry Committee, and they have also incorporated many chapters into their report. That itself shows that there seems to be a consensus of opinion with regard to this matter, and yet the Government use their officers in order to force the hands of the people and create situations out of which they find it very difficult to extricate themselves. Sir, I hope the hon. the Revenue Member who has a reputation for mercy, who has got a reputation for love of truth, who has got a reputation for everything that is good (' Hear, hear ' and Laughter) will forget that he is the Revenue Member of the Government of Madras (Laughter) when he has to deal with this very important matter. I therefore join in the appeal that has been made by the hon. Mover, and I would request the hon. the Revenue Member to see that this thing is dealt with in a manner that situations that have been created are not repeated and the people's case is considered sympathetically."

* Mr. C. Indrayya:—" Mr. President, Sir, coming as I do from the districts where this incident took place, I feel it my duty to support this motion. Before I deal with the conduct of the officer in question, I must briefly preface it by stating the events that have led up to the summoning of the meeting on the 18th of this month. Ever since the publication by the Government of the notification, G.O. No. 1486 giving effect to the proposals of Mr. Holdsworth with regard to the enhanced rates, the ryots in my district and also in the district of East Godavari woke up and began to realise their helplessness in this matter. They began to ventilate their grievances by holding meetings. Various meetings were held all through the districts, and resolutions were passed praying the Government to cancel the G.O. No. 1486, as the ryots are not able to bear any additional taxation under the present economic conditions. To carry on further propaganda in the matter, several ryots'

[Mr. C. Indrayya] [31st October 1931

organizations, firka organizations, taluk organizations, and district organizations came into existence, and the movement has been gaining strength day by day. And either at the instance of the Government or on their own initiative some of the over-zealous Revenue officers of the Government took it into their heads to organize a counter-agitation in the matter and try to interfere with the free expression of opinion of the people with regard to the resettlement. With this object in view I understand an informal gathering was held on the 13th of this month in the office of the Ellore Revenue Divisional Officer. There the District Collector of West Godavari, I understand, was also present. Some other non-officials of the district also were present, to decide upon a course of action with regard to this agitation that has been going on in the district. There it was decided to convene a meeting of the people of the district on the 18th instant, and it was also decided at that meeting that invitations should be issued over the signature of Rao Bahadur Mothay Gangaraju to all the people in the district. Accordingly invitations were issued over his signature to various people in the district asking them to attend the meeting to be convened on the 18th of this month. The object of the meeting, as announced in those invitations, was to organize a People's Party in the district with a view to publish the truth about the resettlement question. That was the object as stated in the invitations. Accordingly on the 18th of October at the appointed time, 4 p.m. several people gathered there, not only people to whom invitations were issued but also several others to whom no invitations were sent. There were several leading ryots and there were several leading title-holders present on the occasion. The District Collector of West Godavari, I understand, was also present there. The Revenue Divisional Officers of Bhimavaram, Narasapur and Kovvur, I understand, were also present on the occasion. Then the Ellore Revenue Divisional Officer was proposed to the chair and he commenced his speech by stating the object of the meeting to be to form a People's Association or a People's Party in the district. Mr. D. Narayana Raju, I understand, asked the president whether others would be allowed an opportunity to speak on the occasion, and the president replied that only speakers selected by him would be allowed to speak and no others. It seems that Mr. Narayana Raju protested against the reply given by the president and said that it was not proper not to allow others to speak on the occasion. The president got wild, I understand, and said, 'You have no business to talk here; shut up; sit down' and so on. He was thus insulted by the president. Thus, he was made to sit and the president was proceeding with his speech and he was stating in the course of his speech that some people were misrepresenting facts with regard to the resettlement and propagating false ideas."

4-45 p.m. Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I rise to a point of order, Sir. I am afraid he is going into matters sub-judice."

* Mr. C. INDRAYYA :—" Mr. President, I shall not go into the merits of the prosecution or into the conduct of the Revenue Divisional Officer in arresting the five gentlemen on the occasion. I will only deal with one act of the Revenue Divisional Officer, i.e., insulting some of the

31st October 1931] [Mr. C. Indrayya]

leading gentlemen of the district who gathered there. One Mr. Narayana Deo from East Godavari was brought specially to Ellore to make a speech on the 18th and he was asked to address the gathering. For some time he addressed the gathering. During his speech there were some hissings and interruptions and subsequently the meeting was dissolved. Then followed the arrest of the five gentlemen. I am not concerned with the arrest. It is not my business to deal with the propriety or otherwise of the arrest or the conduct of the Magistrate in arresting them. Revenue officers in the district are entrusted with the revenue and administration of criminal justice. They are invested with certain powers. It is their duty to watch public opinion in the district and to report to the Government impartially. Revenue officers should not organize counter-propaganda or become parties to public meetings. If the Government want to carry on counter-propaganda in the matter, let them do it by all means. But let them not instruct Revenue officers who are invested with powers. Let them appoint special officers to carry on propaganda in the matter. In this connexion I may tell you one other instance which took place in my own taluk of Narasapur. Mr. Manne Satyanarayana is a village munsif owning 200 acres of land and paying Rs. 1,000 as land tax. He happened to preside over a ryots' conference at Palakole, Narasapur taluk."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am afraid, Sir, that my friend is going beyond the limits of the resolution before us. I submit that the motion is limited to what occurred in a public meeting held at Ellore on a particular date, the 18th October. He refers to actions of other persons on other days."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. Probably the hon. Member wanted to throw further light upon the conduct that was exhibited on that particular date. However, I request the hon. Member not to mention that particular point again."

* Mr. C. INDRAYYA:—"Now there is a criminal case pending against all these five people. So, I am not going to express any opinion on the conduct of the Magistrate. If, after the case is over, the Revenue Board institutes an enquiry, I hope justice will be done to the gentlemen concerned. With these few remarks I have great pleasure in supporting this motion."

* Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA:—"Mr. President, Sir, before I go into the subject proper I must answer one insidious insinuation made by an hon. Member from the other side. It was stated that a man should rise above his interests and do his duty. (Hear, hear.) In stating so, probably my friend judges others by his own standard. (Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: 'I have no relations.') That I am one who can rise above personal interest is clear from the fact that the supporters of the accused after arrest came and requested me to appear on their behalf. Another thing is that, when they convened a protest meeting they came and asked me to preside and to speak therein. Before this meeting was announced they came with a written notice and

asked me to sign the same. I said that so far as resettlement rates were concerned I was one in perfect agreement with them in raising my protest against the action and conduct of the Government. I have done so fearlessly here and elsewhere and I continue to do it. I made this point clear to them and added that I cannot be a party to muster people to disturb a meeting held under the auspices of the West Godavari People's Association. I said, 'Don't spoil your programme by attending and coming into conflicts with meetings which other parties organize and hold. If you carry on your work it is a sufficient condemnation of the counter-propaganda '. I said, I cannot be a party and I won't sign the notice. Secondly the day on which the meeting was convened one gentleman interested came to me and ascertained from me whether I would attend the meeting in the evening. Then again I said, 'It seems to me to be a private meeting. If they do not allow you it is not right for you to speak there at all. You organize a different meeting and speak there.' I am sorry to have to refer to these incidents. But for the fact that an insinuation was made and I am forced to speak I should not have referred to these incidents. (Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan: 'I did not mention names.') You need not mention names. It is clear enough to everybody. I protest against it most emphatically. People in my own district and people who are supporting the accused know what I am. I do not care whether my hon. Friend judges me after his own standard. Of course I happened to be present at the meeting and I cannot help stating what I know. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: 'In spite of your advice not to attend.') I did not advise them not to attend. I advised them to restrain themselves and speak in their own meeting. I also told them that I may or may not attend and that if my Court work permitted I would attend. It is not a matter about those things that is in issue. (Cries of 'Oh!'). The cry of 'Oh' does not matter either. (Laughter.) I am accustomed to this sort of interruptions.

"Then coming to the question, Sir, my friend read the notice from a certain paper. I do not know whether he has got the authority to say that the organizers of the meeting published the notice to the effect that there will be a public meeting. So far as I am aware, there was separate special invitation sent to some members. (A voice: 'Were they not tom-tommed?') Then, when some of these people who had no invitation wanted to attend. . . (A voice: 'Why did you attend?') Because I was invited. They said they would merely attend the meeting and not take part in it. I am not going to discuss the subsequent proceedings because according to me they are matters which cannot be discussed in the Council so long as a case is pending in Court. So far as the conduct of the Revenue officers is coneerned in organizing or giving their support to the meeting, there is nothing wrong; it is not the Revenue officers that have to be blamed but the Government that put them in this ridiculous position. In answer to clause (*g*) of question No. 445-A of Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan, viz., whether there are any instructions to Revenue officials to carry on counter-propaganda

31st October 1931] [Mr. B. Venkataramayya]

on the resettlement propaganda, this is what the Government say: 'Yes: A leaflet on the subject has been sent to the Collectors for distribution in the villages. A copy of the leaflet is attached.' The leaflet says:

'They have spread the collection of increase over a period of 3 and 4 years respectively in the case of lands in which the enhancement is 18¾ per cent. and those on which it is 12½ per cent. . . Considering that even this concession may not meet the situation if the downward tendency of prices continues Government have undertaken to examine the question whether the amount of remission granted in each fasli might not be increased with reference to the economic situation prevailing at the time when kist collections are due to begin. Please remember this important assurance and do not listen to the advice of interested agitators who will incite you to unconstitutional courses of action.'

"What can the poor Revenue subordinate do in the light of the instructions of Government? I do not see anything wrong in the conduct of the Revenue subordinates to obey the mandates of the Government. Well, so far as the merits are concerned, I already said that I am not going to speak about it, nor is it permissible to do so. So that I do not really see the object of the Mover in moving the motion or in wording it as a protest against the conduct of the Revenue officials. It is under the authoritative mandate of the Government that the meetings were held. As regards the other point I am in perfect agreement with him; notwithstanding all our agitation, Government have come to a certain view, passed the Government Order and enhanced the rates. Still they say there is time yet to consider for not collecting the rates at all. In spite of that statement they know that members are not going to rest content. Why should the Government not say at least now: 'We are not going to enforce the rates in which case there will be no trouble at all.'? Instead of asking the subordinates to carry on counter-propaganda, I should think that would be the better course.

"All the same, I am not in agreement with those who preach a no-tax campaign. I am certainly jealous of the ryots' interests, and I am myself organizing Ryots' associations in my own way and telling them that their associations are for the protection of their own interests, not merely against the injustice done to them by the present Government but probably also the injustice that may be done by future governments, as even under a government by our own people there may be such occasions. I tell them that as such occasions might arise they will have to organize their own associations, memorialize the Government and send their protests, and that if they proceed on that footing the Government would still yield to them and cancel the collection of any enhanced tax. Well, Sir, as to what would happen in the future, that is a matter to be considered then. 5 p.m.

"Again, Sir, there seems to be some truth in the assertion on the part of the Government that not altogether true facts are put before the ryots by some speakers at these meetings. I have to say that because, in certain meetings organized as Ryots' associations resolutions are sent up to us that we Legislative Councillors should resign our seats because the Government did not cancel the resettlement rates.

What does that mean ? That shows that these meetings of ryots are organized not merely in the interests of the ryots but to do propaganda work for some other purpose. (A voice: What is the purpose ?) You and I know what it is. We find there is a certain section saying that we ought not to go to the Legislative Council. What is the meaning of that propaganda ? (A voice: Is it to displace you ?) That is how the electorate is educated. I say that would not do. By all means be earnest about the ryots' interests and organize associations to really protest against the conduct of the Government. The Government may not agree with you. But if you have your own views on the matters and feel that a certain position taken up by the Government is wrong, there is nothing wrong in expressing your own view-point, and pressing it, till you succeed in the matter. Success may be attained by several methods, I may adopt one method, and another man may adopt another method. At the same time, I may say that I am no supporter of the Government in respect of the resettlement question. I have not only presided over but have preached at meetings that the attitude of the Government on this question is not correct. On that point, I am absolutely clear. But there are certain persons who want to take part in meetings and create disturbances and thus take the consequences of their action. Well, if they are prepared to do so, let them do so.

"As I said before, when the mattter is pending before a Court of law, why should it be brought up here now ? In so far as it is argued that it is merely to criticize the conduct of the Revenue officers, I have shown there is absolutely no point in it. While particular parties might carry on their agitation against the Government, it may be that the other associations are organized by the officials or even by the Government itself. Yet, people have their own liberty to organize meetings as they like. But my hon. Friends on the other side say, 'just go and disturb those meetings organized by some other party that has a different programme.' That is not right." (Interruptions.)

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member has exceeded his time."

Rao Sahib B. VENKATARAMAYYA :—" I submit I have made my position absolutely clear, and I do not want to speak further."

* The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" Mr. President, Sir, my hon. Friend, the Mover of this resolution, began by explaining, as an apology for bringing this motion for the adjournment of the business of the House, that he was not able to get adequate information from the Government in answer to interpellations. Well, Sir, I must repudiate that charge on behalf of my Colleagues and myself. I can assure hon. Members that we do endeavour to obtain and give them information which they require. It is true that on occasions we refrain from complying with requests for information, generally because it would involve considerable amount of labour—and labour necessarily means expense—if that information were to be collected. But it is our

31st October 1931] [Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell]

endeavour to give hon. Members of this House all the information they may desire to have and which we can supply them with at a reasonable cost.

" Now, Sir, the motion is moved with reference to the conduct of the Revenue Divisional Officer in connexion with a certain meeting held at Ellore on the 18th October. I gather that objection is taken to his action in the following respects:—In the first place that he ought not to take any part at all in this movement to place before the people the truth about the resettlement; in the second place that he ought not to have sent out a covering letter to invite certain persons to attend the meeting which was called by Rao Bahadur Mothay Ganga Raju; in the third place, when some one wanted to speak at the meeting he should not have told him that it rested with the chairman to decide who was to speak at the meeting. Well, Sir, as regards the first point, I may read the following rule which is found in the Government Servants' Conduct Rules issued by the Government of India:—

'A Government servant may, for the purpose of removing misappprehensions, correcting misstatements and refuting disloyal and seditious propaganda, defend and explain in public the policy of the Government.'

" That shows that the Revenue officers were acting within their rights, if they had to deal with certain misstatements or something of that kind. Now, Sir, the information which had been received by the Collector of the district and which has been passed on to the Government is that misstatements were made in various meetings of ryots which were convened in different parts of the district. These were the kind of misstatements that were being made; that the taram of the class of lands is being raised—Rs. 2 land being raised to Rs. 3, Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 and so on; that in addition, the classification sources of irrigation were being raised and that this was being done before the enhancement of the rates is brought into force. It is true in one or two cases, there have been certain changes in the classification, but I think these have been generally in favour of the ryot rather than the other way. Another statement which has been made is that the water-cess is to be increased in this fasli; that is also a misstatement. Then, it is generally stated that the whole of the three annas increase would be put on and collected in this fasli, although the Government definitely stated that at the outset they will not collect more than one anna in the increase, and nothing whatever was said about the Government being willing to consider further whether any increase should be put on at all this year until we knew what the position was just before the time when the kist was due for collection. Those misstatements were naturally alarming the people, and, in addition, some speakers added words to the effect that there was no use carrying on constitutional agitation any more as the Government would not listen and that possibly the only thing to do was to have recourse to a no-tax campaign. This was very disturbing to the people of the district, and I think that the Revenue officers were perfectly right in taking measures, in which they had our support, to correct these misstatements and misapprehensions. Now, Sir, the way in which that can be done is naturally by convening

[Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell] [31st October 1931

meetings of ryots at various places at which prominent non-officials who are well acquainted with the matter may be invited to address them. As far as I know, in this particular meeting there was no resolution under discussion, but it was merely a meeting for conveying information to the people who attended it.

" Now, as regards the charge that the Revenue Divisional Officer should not have sent the invitation in support of Mr. Mothey Ganga Raju's notice, I confess I can see no reason whatsoever why he should not have done so. Naturally, it was his desire that the leading representatives of the people of the neighbourhood should be present at this meeting and the fact that he would be likely to make what might be regarded as an official exposition of Government's policy would add force to the invitation.

" Then, Sir, as regards the charge that he regulated the speakers, that, I believe, is the usual duty of the chairman. In this House, any one who attempts to speak without your permission, Sir, is at once out of order, and I believe that is the general rule at all public meetings, that it is the chairman who regulates the proceedings and who decides who should speak at any particular moment, and no one should address the meeting without the permission of the chairman.

" My hon. Friend, Mr. Indrayya, asked me whether I will institute an enquiry regarding the conduct of the Revenue Divisional Officer at this meeting, after the judicial proceedings now going on are over. Well, Sir, I cannot make any such promise, because to make a promise of an enquiry will *prima facie* prejudge the case which is under enquiry. I shall, however, be prepared to look into the records of the case and see whether there is any case for an enquiry to be made. I do not wish to say anything with reference to the conduct of the Revenue Divisional Officer either one way or the other lest it should prejudice the proceedings of the court.

" The Mover of this motion suggested that we should not rely on the reports of our district officers as regards the condition of the district, because they are naturally prejudiced and would make reports in the direction which would please the Government. It is not my experience that district officers are not prepared to put forward what are their real opinions. I do not think for one moment that they feel cowed in any way or think that they must not give their true opinion. Certainly that is not my experience.

" In this case I have not expressed any *prima facie* opinion one way or the other. At the same time, I may mention that the Commissioner for Land Revenue and Settlement is about to proceed to these districts in the course of a few days and he will make personal enquiries. I hope
5-15 p.m. that I may be able to visit these districts before the end of the year. The first kist will fall due on the 10th January.

" The last speaker, Mr. Venkataramayya said that he was not in sympathy with the orders of the Government and that he intended to proceed with constitutional agitation against those orders. We have got no objection to any action on the part of the people taken with a

31st October 1931] [Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell]

view to place before us the actual facts and arguments. We want to know what the facts are regarding the condition of the people. We do not want mere abuse; that does not affect us one way or the other. I do not think that at the present time we can make up our minds fairly as to what we should do; for no one can tell just now, nor can any one have the courage to prophesy, what will take place during the next two months as regards the financial situation. I hope my remarks will have some effect in allaying suspicions regarding the attitude of Government in this matter.''

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—'' I submit to the House, Sir, that the object of bringing this motion gained emphasis on account of its connexion with the severity of the enhanced settlement rates. Ordinarily, a conduct of the nature complained of might not attract much attention if it was not combined with the severity of the tax. Therefore, having regard to the larger interests involved in the matter, whether the explanation of the Government in regard to the conduct of the officer concerned is satisfactory or not to this House, and having regard to the fact that the hon. the Revenue Member is still in the process of thinking whether the levy of one anna rate should be imposed this year or not, I should rather like to give no reason to complain against the attitude of this House in coming to that decision favourable to the agriculturists. With the assurance that at any rate we shall not be the persons who would be made an excuse for the continuance of the levy of that enhanced rate, discretion prompts me to withdraw the motion.''

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The House adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

[31st October 1931

APPENDIX I.

[*Vide* answer to question No. 371 asked by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 218 supra.]

A

List of officers with pay of Rs. 1,000 and above who pay rent to the Government for the Government buildings occupied by them.

Designation of the officer.	Locality.	Monthly standard rent.
		RS.
Revenue Divisional Officer	Berhampur	92
Collector	Chatrapur	* 175
District Forest Officer	Do.	114
Special Forest Officer	Parlakimedi	122
Executive Engineer	Berhampur	44
District Judge	Do.	178
District Medical Officer	Do.	110
District Superintendent of Police	Chatrapur	63
Conservator of Forests	Waltair	104
Superintending Engineer	Do.	140
Executive Engineer	Do.	97
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	95
District Forest Officer	Do.	51
Revenue Divisional Officer	Parvatipuram	34
District Superintendent of Police	Koraput	60
Special Assistant Agent	Do.	61
Sub-Collector	Bhadrachalam	86
Executive Engineer (Quarter No. I)	Dowlaishweram	111
Do. (Quarter No. II)	Do.	101
Do. (Quarter No. III)	Do.	87
District Medical and Sanitary Officer	Cocanada	131
District Superintendent of Police	Do	138
Executive Engineer	Chettipet	88
Sub-Collector	Bezwada	88
Executive Engineer (Kistna Central)	Do.	92
Superintending Engineer	Do.	143
Sub-Collector	Ongole	90
District Judge	Masulipatam	109
Collector	Do.	169
District Forest Officer	Guntur	125
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	98
District Medical and Sanitary Officer	Do.	97
Executive Engineer	Do.	93
District Judge	Do.	155
District Collector	Do.	140
District Superintendent of Police	Nellore	76
Collector	Do.	116
Civilian Divisional Officer	Gudur	97
Executive Engineer	Nellore	48
Sub-Collector	Tellicherry	40
Collector	Calicut	191
Executive Engineer	Do.	93
District Judge	Do.	126
Additional District Magistrate	Do.	81
District Medical Officer	Do.	173
Sub-Collector	Coondapoor	105
Special Assistant Collector	Malappuram	46
Sub-Collector	Pollachi	77
Imperial Officer's Quarters No. I	Coimbatore	63
Do. No. II	Do.	80
Do. No. III	Do.	77

* Remission of Rs. 18 allowed for the portion of the residence used as office.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

31st October 1931]

List of officers with pay of Rs. 1,000 and above who pay rent to the Government for the Government buildings occupied by them—*cont.*

Designation of the officer.	Locality.	Monthly standard rent.
		RS.
Imperial Officer's Quarters No. IV	Coimbatore	77
Do. No. V	Do.	86
Do. No. VI	Do.	87
Do. No. VII	Do.	122
Do. No. VIII	Do.	122
Madras Forest College (Principal)	Do.	122
Imperial Instructor No. I	Do.	97
Do. No. II	Do.	92
Superintending Engineer	Do.	89
Executive Engineer	Do.	71
Conservator of Forests	Do.	100
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	86
District Forest Officer, South	Do.	77
Do. North	Do.	84
District Medical Officer	Do.	80
District Judge	Do.	279
Deputy Inspector-General of Police	Do.	255
Collector of the Nilgiris	Ootacamund	154
District Medical Officer, the Nilgiris	Do.	135
Conservator of Forests	Salem	377
District Forest Officer, South Salem	Do.	91
District Forest Officer, Central Salem	Do.	111
District Forest Officer	Tiruppattur	57
Do.	Kollegal	51
Collector of Salem	Salem	199
Sub-Collector	Hosur	55
District Judge	Salem	139
Executive Engineer	Do.	38
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	93
District Medical Officer	Do.	99
District Forest Officer, North Salem	Hosur	56
Sub-Collector	Tiruppattur	54
Collector	Vellore	137
Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Central Range	Do.	114
Executive Engineer	Do.	88
District Judge	Do.	111
Sub-Collector	Nandyal	109
Collector	Chittoor	104
Revenue Divisional Officer	Chandragiri	81
Executive Engineer	Madanapalle	43
District Superintendent of Police	Chittoor	27
Collector	Cuddapah	192
Revenue Divisional Officer	Rajampet	103
District Forest Officer	Cuddapah	69
District Judge	Do.	288
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	161
Collector	Bellary	194
District Judge	Do	178
District Forest Officer	Anantapur	48
District Judge	Do.	108
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	99
Do.	Bellary	117
Conservator of Forests	Do.	180
Collector	Anantapur	159
Sub-Collector	Hospet	80
Principal, Police Recruit's School	Anantapur	69
District Superintendent of Police	St. Thomas' Mount	102
Sub-Collector	Chingleput	88
Resident Medical Officer, General Hospital	Madras	103
Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital	Egmore	129
Surgeon, First District	Rayapuram	155

[31st October 1931

List of officers with pay of Rs. 1,000 and above who pay rent to the Government for the Government buildings occupied by them—*cont.*

Designation of the officer.	Locality.	Monthly standard rent.
		RS.
Superintendent, Government Mental Hospital	Kilpauk	180
Resident Medical Officer, New Hospital	Rayapuram	125
New Engineering College, G-I Professor	Guindy	114
Do. G-II Professor	Do.	115
Do. G-III Professor	Do.	135
Resident Medical Officer	Royapetta	88
Chief Engineer, Public Works Department	Madras	128
Adyar House, Adyar	Adyar	266
Brodie Castle	Do.	392
Bridge House	Do.	198
The Grange	Do.	348
Principal, Presidency College	Chepauk	84
Principal, Teachers' College, Saidapet	Saidapet	125
Guindy Park (Surgeon's Bungalow)	Guindy	137
Principal, New Engineering College	Do.	166
Guindy Park (Aide-de-Camp's Bungalow)	Do.	50
Director, King Institute	Do.	109
Executive Engineer, Vennar division	Tanjore	87
District Medical Officer	Do.	94
Executive Engineer, Cauvery division	Do.	65
District Judge	Do.	117
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	138
Sub-Collector, Kumbakonam	Kumbakonam	100
Sub-Collector	Negapatam	73
District Judge, East Tanjore	Do.	208
Executive Engineer	Cuddalore	89
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	79
District Medical Officer	Do.	91
District Judge	Do.	195
Sub-Collector	Tindivanam	60
Superintending Engineer	Trichinopoly	175
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	122
District Medical Officer	Do.	121
Executive Engineer	Do.	153
Collector	Do.	191
District Judge	Do.	199
Sub-Collector	Karur	86
Executive Engineer	Madura	89
Sub-Collector	Dindigul	66
Do	Ramnad	98
District Medical Officer	Do.	41
District Superintendent of Police	Madura	72
Collector of Ramnad	Do.	113
District Judge	Do.	204
District Superintendent of Police	Do.	132
District Medical Officer	Do.	112
Executive Engineer	Do.	115
Collector	Do.	229
District Superintendent of Police	Palamcottah	70
District Forest Officer	Do.	69
Executive Engineer	Do.	73
District Medical Officer	Do.	74
Revenue Divisional Officer	Shermadevi	89
Do.	Sivakasi	93
Sub-Collector	Tuticorin	73

NOTE.—This list shows the officers whose average salary is Rs. 1,000 and above who occupy Government buildings. The rent shown in each case is the standard rent of the residence as shown in the Capital and Revenue Accounts for Residences for 1929-30. The actual rent paid is the standard rent or 10 per cent of the officers' emoluments whichever is less.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

B

List of officers with pay of Rs. 1,000 and above on whose behalf the Government pays rent.

Officer.	Amount of rent.
	RS.
1. Deputy Commissioner of Police, Crime Branch, Madras City	275
2. The Superintendent of Prisons, Madras ...	250
3. The Director, Pasteur Institute, Coonoor ...	200

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 373 asked by Rao Sahib P. Venkataramayya at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 219 supra.]

Statement showing the staff employed in the offices of the Chief Engineers and the language area to which the staff belongs.

—	Andhra district.	Tamil.	Kanarese.	Malayalam.	Ceylon.
General, Buildings and Roads.					
Superintendents	1	4	1	..	..
Clerks	3	32	1	3	1
Typists (including temporary) ..	..	7	..	..	..
Supervisor	..	2	..	..	..
Draughtsmen (including one temporary)	..	17	1	..	..
Tracers	..	2	..	..	..
Attenders	2	6	..	..	..
Blueprinter (temporary) ..	..	1	..	..	..
Total ..	6	71	3	3	1
Irrigation.					
Manager and Superintendents ..	..	4	..	..	..
Upper Division clerks	.	9	..	..	..
Lower do.	..	11	..	1	..
Typists	..	5	..	..	..
Attenders	1	4	..	..	..
Head Draughtsman	..	1	..	..	..
Draughtsmen, I grade	..	2	..	..	..
Do. II do.	..	6	..	..	..
Do. III do.	1	8	..	..	..
Tracers	..	4	..	..	..
Total ..	2	54	..	1	..

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 383 asked by Rao Sahib B. Venkataramayya at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 227 supra.]

Statement showing the staff employed in the Surgeon-General's office.

—	Tamil.	Telugu.	Malayalam.	Kanarese.
Manager and Superintendents (6)	5	..	..	1
Clerks (29)	20	4	5	..
Typists (5)	4	1	..	..
Attenders (2)	2	..	..	..
Daffadar, Peons and others	10	5	1	..

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to question No. 388 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 231 supra.]

From the Collector of South Kanara, L. Dis. No. 7354–31, *dated 20th September* 1931.

Allowances—Tasdik—Stoppage—Legislative Council Question No. 71.

Government Memo. No. 25992-1, L. & M., dated 23rd July 1931.

The tasdiks have been withheld mainly due to one or other of the following causes:—

(1) Absence of moktessors.
(2) Trustees not claiming tasdik.
(3) For want of duly appointed trustees.
(4) Dissension among trustees.
(5) Institutions in disrepairs and services not performed regularly.

I enclose lists[a] in original, showing particulars asked in part (*b*) of the question.

[a] Placed in the Council library.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to question No. 416 asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 250 supra.]

Extract from the Notification of the introduction of the new settlement rates into the South Kanara district.

Government having sanctioned the scheme for the revision of the land assessment of the South Kanara district, it is hereby notified that the revenue settlement will be introduced on the following general lines.

* * * *

7. *Dry land.*—Under this head is included all patta land not classed as " wet " or " garden ".

* * * *

9. *Classification.*—All culturable " wet " or "dry " land has been found to belong either to the " red ferruginous " or " arenaceous " series of soils. The " red ferruginous " series has been divided into three classes with five sorts in each, and "arenaceous " into three classes with three sorts in each. . .

10. *Grouping.*—For " wet " and " dry " lands there will be three groups. In the first group will be placed those villages which have good means of communication with ports and markets, which are thickly populated and in which labour is plentiful. In the third or lowest group will be placed the villages situated in unhealthy jungly localities at the foot of the hills. The second group will comprise villages occupying an intermediate position between the first and third groups, which are not so well off as regards communications and labour as first group villages. But the coast villages north of the Chandragiri river will, in consideration of their special circumstances, be placed in a special group for purposes of wet assessment only, ranking above the first group.

* * * *

13. *Dry rates.*—These have been calculated in a manner similar to the wet rates, taking ragi as the standard crop. The standard out-turn per acre which has been adopted is 25 per cent lower than the average rates for the Presidency. The commutation rate has been

[31st October 1931

taken at Rs. 175 per garce of 3,200 Madras measures and a deduction of one-fifth has been made for vicissitudes of season and unprofitable areas. The money rates sanctioned are given in column 9 below:—

Taram. (1)	Outturn per acre in Madras measures. (2)	Grain value at Rs. 175 per garce of 3,200 Madras measures. (3)	Deduct one-fifth for vicissitudes of season and unprofitable areas. (4)	Remainder. (5)	Deduct cultivation expenses. (6)	Remainder or net value. (7)	Half net value on account of Government share. (8)	Sanctioned rates. (9)
		RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A.
I	240	13 2 0	2 10 0	10 8 0	6 0	4 8 0	2 4 0	2 0
II	220	12 0 6	2 6 6	9 10 0	6 0	3 10 0	1 13 0	1 8
III	200	10 15 0	2 3 0	8 12 0	5 8	3 4 0	1 10 0	1 4
IV	175	9 9 2	1 14 8	7 10 6	5 0	2 10 6	1 5 3	1 0
V	150	8 3 3	1 10 3	6 9 0	4 8	2 1 0	1 0 6	0 12
VI	120	6 9 0	1 5 0	5 4 0	4 0	1 4 0	0 10 0	0 8
VII	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0 6
VIII	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0 4

These rates will be charged on all "occupied dry" lands except kumari, kumaki and bane lands and lands subject to hakkal cultivation, regarding which, separate orders will be issued hereafter.

APPENDIX VI.

[Vide answer to question No. 417 asked by Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 250 supra.]

Letter from M. K. Vellodi, Esq., I.C.S., Collector of North Arcot, dated 14*th September* 1931, *R.O.C. No. E.*5. 9670/31.

(1) There is a chain of tanks below Pudu Eri and Peria Eri in Alangayam village, Tiruppattur taluk. The names of the tanks are given below. All of them are in charge of the Revenue Department.

In Narasingapuram village.

1. Vitalappa Nayakan Eri.
2. Kolandaikavandan Kuttai.

In Alangayam village.

3. Jambu Eri.

In Narasingapuram village.

4. Palimaneri.
5. Vengadathan Eri.
6. Peria Eri or Pudu Eri.

31st October 1931]

In Marimanikuppam village.

7. Dasa Reddi upper tank.
8. Dasa Reddi lower tank.

In Irunapet village.

9. Yeguleri tank.

(2) All these tanks are only rain-fed tanks. They did not receive for the past few years sufficient water for purposes of irrigation owing to failure of rains.

(3) A statement showing the amount of remission granted for the past six years under the sources coming in the chain in Alangayam village is enclosed.

(4) A scheme for diverting the water of a jungle stream into the Alangayam Peria Eri was considered by me in May last. The scheme involved the acquisition of ryotwari lands in order to excavate a channel to a distance of about 7,000 feet. Excluding land compensation, the cost of scheme was roughly estimated at Rs. 5,300. The Sub-Collector suggested that if the ryots could make arrangements to acquire the ryotwari lands required for the channel by private negotiations, Government may undertake the excavation of the channel. I accordingly proposed to consider the scheme in detail, after the ryots get possession of the land required for the channel. The ryots of Alangayam village have also been informed of this. I have not yet heard from them.

சட்டமன்ற பேரவை
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

Statement showing the ayakat, assessment and the amount of remission under the sources in Alangayam village, Tirupattur taluk.

Fasli.	Peria Eri.			Jambu Eri.			Pudu Eri or Buchu Chetti Kuttai.			Vitalappa Naicken Eri (the tank has ayakat in Narasingapuram village also).		
	Ayakat.	Assessment.	Amount of remission.	Ayakat.	Assessment.	Amount of remission.	Ayakat.	Assessment.	Amount of remission.	Ayakat.	Assessment.	Amount of remission.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
	ACS.	RS. A.	RS. A.	ACS.	RS. A.	RS. A.	ACS.	RS. A.	RS. A.	ACS.	RS. A.	RS. A.
1335	95·98	700 11	172 2	39·71	186 14	18 3	5·72	24 7	..	9·14	63 6	43 10
1336	..	..	139 5	..	..	12 4	..	..	..	..	..	..
1337	..	..	225 6	..	..	114 10	..	..	..	..	..	43 10
1338	..	..	105 2	..	..	120 6	..	..	..	..	..	43 10
1339	..	..	316 11	..	..	118 4	..	..	17 14	..	..	43 10
1340	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

31st October 1931]

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to question No. 427 asked by Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Goundar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 259 supra.]

Statement.

North Salem Division—	
Buffaloes	As. 12
Cows	„ 8
Sheep	„ 4
Central Salem Division—	
(1) Chitteri Range excluding Chitteri Plateau—	
Buffaloes	Re 1—2—0
Cows	As. 9
Sheep	„ 4½
(2) Attur Range—	
Buffaloes	Re. 1—2—0
Cows	As. 9
Sheep	„ 4½
(3) Cauvery Range—	
(*a*) Arasankadai, Manjavadi and Kappathu Reserves in South Shevaroy—	
Buffaloes	Re. 1—2—0
Cows	As. 9
Sheep	„ 4½
(*b*) Other reserves in Shevaroy South—	
Buffaloes	As. 12
Cows	„ 8
Sheep	„ 3
(*c*) Lokur, Bommiyampatti Karaivaipudur Reserve in Shevaroy North—	
Buffaloes	As. 12
Cows	„ 8
Sheep	„ 3
(*d*) Other reserves in Shevaroy North—	
Buffaloes	Re. 1—2—0
Cows	As. 9
Sheep	„ 4½
South Salem Division—	
Namakkal and Kollimalais—	
Buffaloes	As. 12
Cows	„ 6
Sheep	„ 3
Other reserves—	
Buffaloe	Re. 1—2—0
Cows	As. 9
Sheep	„ 4½

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide answer to question No. 436 asked by Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 264 supra.]

(*True copy from* Swarajya, *dated* 10*th September*.)

ADVICE TO VILLAGE OFFICERS.

Collector's circular.

Chittoor Again.

(From a correspondent.) Chittoor, September 9.

The following is a copy of the emergent order issued on 22nd August to all village officers in the Chittoor district by the Collector and distributed in the Chendragiri taluk by the Tahsildar.

Emergent order to all village magistrates and the karnams:—

It is published in the newspapers that the pact between Gandhi and the Government is broken. You must hereafter consider that the Congressmen are the enemies of the Government. The District Collector has notified that every action of theirs, viz., meetings, processions, propaganda, etc., must be put down without being carried on in the least. Therefore, whenever Congressmen or any one connected with them carry on any meetings, processions or propaganda in your villages you must forthwith send reports through the village mudam (servant) in the report book to the police and to the Sub-Magistrate of Tirupati with full details and report that fact to us on ordinary paper. Severe action will be taken against the village officers who are negligent in this matter. The list herewith sent should be signed in token of the receipt of this notice and the list should be returned.

Very emergent.

APPENDIX IX.

[Vide answer to question No. 441 asked by Mr. M. Devadasan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, page 267 supra.]

IN THE COURT OF THE SECOND-CLASS MAGISTRATE OF TIRUVADANAI.

Dated 14th June 1931.

PRESENT:

M.R.Ry. A. PERIASAMY THEVAR,
Sub-Magistrate.

M.C. No. 4 *of* 1931.

Read—Report, dated 13th June 1931, from the Inspector of Police, Devakottai.

Order.

On a perusal of the report of the Circle Inspector of Police, Devakottai, and his sworn statement it is seen that A. S. John, President of the Adi-Dravida Mahajana Sabha, Ramnad district, is going to convene meetings at Eluvankottai and other places within the limits of Tiruvadanai taluk with the ostensible object of giving lectures about social evils, etc. From June 1930, the feelings between the Nattars (Kallars) on one side and Adi-Dravidas and Pallars on the other side in Eluvankottai and other villages of Tiruvadanai taluk have been strained and they resulted in rioting and public tranquillity and danger to human life. There have been social restrictions on the depressed members by intimidation, collection of fines and threats to persons and property and as such criminal proceedings under section 107, Criminal Procedure Code, were instituted against several Nattars in various villages of Thennalinad and they have been bound over for a period of one year. These proceedings created bitter feelings among the parties.

Under the above circumstances I apprehend that a breach of the peace is likely to occur if A. S. John and other Adi-Dravidas convene public meetings at Eluvankottai on 14th June 1931 and elsewhere within the limits of Tiruvadanai taluk. I, therefore, consider that it is desirable in the interests of the peace and to avert a disturbance of public tranquillity in the locality that the meeting to be held on 14th June 1931 at Eluvankottai and subsequent meetings by the Adi-Dravidas should be prevented by an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code. As this is an emergent case I pass the following ex parte order.

A. PERIASAMY THEVAR,
Sub-Magistrate.

14th June 1931.

IN THE COURT OF THE SECOND-CLASS MAGISTRATE OF TIRUVADANAI.

Dated 14*th June* 1931.

In Mis. Case No. 4 *of* 1931.

PRESENT:

M.R.RY. A. PERIASAMY THEVAR,
Sub-Magistrate.

Order under section 144, *Criminal Procedure Code.*

To

A. S. John, President, Adi-Dravida Mahajana Saba, Ramnad district.

Chellam Samban of Eluvankottai.

Karuppah Samban of Eluvankottai and all Adi-Dravidas and Pallars in the villages of Tiruvadanai taluk.

Whereas it has been made to appear to me that you A. S. John and others are about to convene a communal meeting at Eluvankottai with the ostensible object of lecturing about social evils, etc., on 14th June 1931 and that such a gathering is likely to lead to a breach of peace on account of the strained feelings existing between the Nattars (Kallars) on one side and Adi-Dravidas and Pallars on the other side, I do hereby prohibit you under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, from holding meetings and giving lectures, etc., at Eluvankottai and anywhere within the limits of Tiruvadanai taluk for such purposes for a period of two months from this date.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 14th day of June 1931.

A. PERIASAMY THEVAR,
Sub-Magistrate.

14th June 1931.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY — TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

31st October 1931]

Appendix X.

[Vide answer to question No. 445-A asked by Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 31st October 1931, at page 270 supra.]

Note on the introduction of resettlement rates in the East Godavari, West Godavari and Kistna districts.

To the ryots of East Godavari, West Godavari and Kistna districts.

It has come to the knowledge of Government that in spite of the clear orders issued by them about the resettlement in the districts of East Godavari, West Godavari and Kistna in G.O. No. 1486 (21-S), dated 11th July 1931 and the Press Communique, dated 4th September 1931 attempts are being made to misrepresent facts and belittle the concession sanctioned by them. This leaflet is issued to inform you of the true facts.

2. The summary of the resettlement proposals already published in the District Gazette and distributed to every village towards the end of 1928 shows very clearly how in spite of the rise in prices which justified a much larger increase of rates, Government were pleased to limit the enhancement to $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent, so as to leave every possible margin for the development of a higher standard of living among the agricultural population.

3. You may also notice that on the eve of resettlement Government, in order to afford as much convenience to the ryots as lay in their power, accepted the resolution passed in the Legislative Council and appointed a non-official Committee to make enquiries into the economic condition of the ryots in the three districts and to examine the rates of enhancement proposed by the Settlement Officer. The Committee submitted its report on 30th January 1930. One of its recommendations was that the proposed increase of assessment should not be given effect to. Now, you may be told by some interested agitators that Government have flouted the opinion of this Committee and have ignored its findings. This is false. The Committee's report was examined paragraph by paragraph and Government were satisfied that the report contained many mis-statements and inaccuracies; it was only after the most careful consideration of the report that Government decided to reject the findings of the Committee and to sanction the enhancement proposed by the Special Settlement Officer and the Board of Revenue which was lenient and justified.

4. There is however one factor that has affected your prosperity during the current year. It is the world-wide economic depression and the fall in prices but Government have not been slow to recognize this. Realizing that the collection of the enhancement of annas three and annas two respectively in the rupee all at once in the current year would be a hardship to you, they have spread the collection of the increase over a period of three and four years respectively in the case of lands in

[31st October 1931

which the enhancement is $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent and those on which it is $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Thus in the former case you will not have to pay an increase of more than one anna in the rupee in the current year and in the latter case an increase of more than six pies for each rupee. The following example will show the assessment which will be payable on a patta in respect of the several kinds of lands until the full resettlement rate is reached:—

Number and name of the holder.	R.S. Nos. of the lands in the patta.	Existing assessment.	Ultimate resettlement assessment.	Assessment payable in fasli.			
				1341	1342	1343	1344
	Lands on which the enhancement is by $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.						
		RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
	474	1 14 0	2 4 0				
	476-1	3 4 0	3 13 0				
	700-4	0 10 0	0 12 0				
	(total)	5 12 0	6 13 0	6 1 0	6 7 0	6 13 0	6 13 0
	Lands on which the enhancement is by $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.						
	8	9 15 0	11 3 0				
	17	6 6 0	7 2 0				
	34	21 12 0	24 8 0				
	252-6	0 3 0	0 3 0				
	283-4	15 10 0	17 7 0				
	(total)	53 14 0	60 7 0	55 6 0	57 1 0	58 12 0	60 7 0
	Lands on which there has been no increase.						
	15-2	3 2 0	3 2 0	3 2 0	3 2 0	3 2 0	3 2 0

This concession has not been granted at the resettlement of any other tract and has been specially granted to you in view of the general financial difficulties of the current year.

5. This is not all. Considering that even this concession may not meet the situation if the downward tendency of prices continues Government have undertaken to examine the question whether the amount of the remission granted in each fasli might not be increased with reference to the economic situation prevailing at the time when kist collections are due to begin. Please remember this important assurance and do not listen to the advice of interested agitators who will incite you to unconstitutional courses of action.